arXiv:1604.05398v3 [math.AG] 7 Aug 2016

Stability of Valuations and Kollár Components

Chi Li and Chenyang Xu

August 9, 2016

Abstract

We show that among all Kollár components obtained by plt blow ups of a klt singularity $o \in (X, D)$, there is at most one that is (log-)K-semistable. We achieve this by showing that if such a Kollár component exists, it minimizes the normalized volume function introduced in [Li15a]. We also prove that for any klt singularity, the infimum of the normalized function is always approximated by the normalized volumes of Kollár components.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**
1.1 Kollár components . . . 3
1.2 Approximation . . . 4

2 Preliminary **5**
2.1 K-semistability . . . 5
2.2 Normalized volume . . . 6
2.3 Properties of Kollár component . . . 10
2.4 Deformation to cone . . . 11

3 K-semistability implies minimum **13**

4 Uniqueness **16**
4.1 Case of cone singularity . . . 16
4.2 The general case . . . 21

5 Volume of models **23**
5.1 Local volume and volume of models . . . 23
5.2 Proof of Theorem 1.6 and 1.5 . . . 26

6 Examples and questions **30**
6.1 Examples . . . 30
6.2 Further questions . . . 35

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, we work over the field $\mathbb{C}$ of complex numbers. It has been well known by people working in higher dimensional geometry that there is

an analogue between the local object Kawamata log terminal (klt) singularities (X, o) and log Fano varieties as the global counterpart (cf. e.g. [Sho00, Xu14] etc.). From this comparison, since the stability theory of Fano varieties has been a central object in people's study in the last three decades, it is natural to expect there is a local stability theory on singularities. This preprint is motivated by developing such a theory. In another word, we want to investigate singularities using the tools from the theory of K-stability, a notion which was first defined in [Tia97] and later algebraically formulated in [Don02]. We note that this interaction between birational geometry and K-stability theory has been proved to significantly fertilize both subjects (cf. [Oda12, Oda13, LX14, WX14, LWX14, Fuj15] etc.).

For the stability theory of log Fano varieties, a crucial ingredient is the CM weight. Philosophically, the stability of log Fano varieties is equivalent to minimizing the CM weight. In the stability theory of singularities, we fix the singularity and look for 'the most stable' valuations. Thus the first step of establishing a local stability theory for (X, o) would be to find the right counterpart of CM weight in the local setting. In the work [Li15a], the first named author defined the normalized volume function on the space of valuations centered at o, which we believe should be the right invariant. In fact, its derivative at the canonical divisorial valuation over the cone singularity along certain tangent direction give the the CM weight. So in the local picture, the normalized volume function indeed carries more information than the CM weight!

By the above discussion, inspired by the global theory, we focus on studying the valuation minimizing the normalized volume function, which is conjectured to uniquely exist and ought to thought as the '(semi-)stable' object. This picture is understood well in the case of Sasakian geometry. Here we expect our study could plausibly recover a similar picture as the one of Sasakian geometry, but for an arbitrary klt singularity (X, o). In fact, in [Li15b, LL16], it was shown that a Fano manifold X is K-semistable, if and only if that among all valuations over the vertex o of the cone $C(X)$ given by a multiple of $-K_X$, the canonical valuation defined to be the one obtained by blowing up the vertex $o \in C(X)$ minimizes the normalized volume function. This gives some evidence to justify that we are on the right direction.

However, we have not been able to completely understand the minimizer, particularly because when the value semigroup has rational rank larger than 1, which in Sasakian geometry corresponds to the irregular case, it seems to have extra difficulties. On the other hand, in this paper, we provide a rather complete picture for the case when the minimizer's value semigroup has rational rank 1, by using a construction from the minimal model program. Recall that for an arbitrary n-dimensional klt singularity (X, o), there is also an approach to connect it to an $n-1$ dimensional $\mathbb{Q}$-Fano variety, via a *Kollár* component (cf. [Xu14]). So we will systematically develop the ideas of using Kollár components to understand the minimizer. In fact, Kollár components can be considered as the local analogue of special degenerations studied in [LX14]. And in Sasakian geometry, the minimizer is given by a Kollár component if and only if we are in the quasi-regular case.

Therefore, to summarize, the aim of this paper is of twofolds: on one hand, we want to use the viewpoint of stability to study the birational geometry construction of Kollár components, and search out a more canonical object under suitable assumptions; on the other hand, we also aim at using the construction

of Kollár components to get information of the valuations space, especially the minimizer of the normalized volume functions. In the below, we will give more details.

1.1 Kollár components

Definition 1.1 (Kollár component)**.** *Let $o \in (X, D)$ be a klt singularity. We call a proper birational morphism $\mu : Y \to X$ provides a* **Kollár component** *E, if μ is isomorphic over $X \setminus \{o\}$, and $\mu^{-1}(o)$ is an irreducible divisor S, such that $(Y, S + \mu_*^{-1}D)$ is pure log terminal and $-S$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier and ample over X.*

We easily see the birational model Y is uniquely determined once the divisorial valuation S is fixed.

Given any klt singularity (X, o), after the necessary minimal model program type result is established (see [BCHM10]), we know that there always exists a Kollár component (see [Pro00] or [Xu14, Lemma 1]), but it is often not unique (nevertheless, see the discussion in 6.1.4 for some known special cases for the uniqueness). From what we have discussed, instead of an arbitrary Kollár component, we want to study those which are more stable, and show if it exists, it provides a more canonical object. Indeed, we show that if there is a K-semistable Kollár component, then it gives the unique minimizer of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(X, o)$ among all Kollár components.

Caveat: Our definition of K-semistability in this paper is different (but is expected to coincide) with the standard one. See Section 2.1.

Compared to the global theory of degeneration of Fano varieties, this fits into the philosophy that K-stability provides a more canonical degeneration(cf. [LWX14, SSY14]) and it should minimize the CM weight among all degenerations. But one surprising thing to us is that K-semistability is enough, instead of K-polystability that was required in the global setting.

In more precise terms, first we have the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *If $o \in (X, D)$ is an algebraic klt singularity. Let S be a Kollár component over X and denote*

$$(K_Y + S + \mu_*^{-1}D)|_S = K_S + \Delta_S.$$

If (S, Δ_S) is (log)-K-semistable. Then $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}$ is minimized at the valuation ord_S.

This extends the main theorem in [LL16] from cone singularities to the more general setting. However, our proof relies on the results there.

Next, we turn to the result on the uniqueness.

Theorem 1.3. *If $o \in (X, D)$ is an algebraic klt singularity. Assume S is a Kollár component over X such that (S, Δ_S) is K-semistable. Then*

$$\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(\mathrm{ord}_S) < \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(\mathrm{ord}_T)$$

for any other Kollár component T.

In fact, by [Li15a, Theorem 3.3], it was expected certain compactness could be used to guarantee that $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}$ always minimizes at some valuation. It is also expected that the minimizer of any klt singularity is always unique (see [Li15a,

Conjecture 6.1.2]). Motivated by these results and following the terminology in Sasakian geometry, we make the definition as follows. For more discussion, see Conjecture 6.5.

Definition 1.4. *For a given klt singularity $o \in (X, D)$, if $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}$ is minimized at ord_S, where S can be taken as a Kollár component, we call it a quasi-regular klt singularity. Otherwise, we call it irregular.*

We expect that if the valuation semigroup of the minimizer has rational rank 1, it should indeed always yield a Kollár component, i.e. it is quasi-regular (see Conjecture 6.5). We confirm this under some assumptions.

Theorem 1.5. *Given an arbitrary algebraic klt singularity $o \in (X, D)$ where $X = \mathrm{Spec}(R)$. Let v be a valuation that minimizes $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}$. Assume the valuation group of v is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$, and one of the following two assumptions holds*

1. *v is a multiple of a divisorial valuation; or*
2. *the graded family of valuative ideals*

$$\{\mathfrak{a}_\bullet\} = \{\mathfrak{a}_k\} \text{ where } \mathfrak{a}_k = \{f \in R \mid v(f) \geq k\}$$

is finitely generated.

Then up to a rescaling, v is given by the divisorial valuation induced by a Kollár component.

We note that a minimizer is conjectured to be quasi-monomial ((cf. [Li15a, Conjecture 6.1.3])) and the graded family of valuative ideals for a minimizer of the normalized volume function is conjectured to be always finitely generated (cf. [Li15a, Conjecture 6.1.5]). So granted any one of these two conjectures, this result should presumably characterize all the cases with minimizers of rational rank 1 (cf. Conjecture 6.5).

1.2 Approximation

In a different direction, we also obtain results which describe the minimizer of the normalized volume function from the viewpoint of Kollár components. We show the following result, which says the infimum of normalized volume can be approximated arbitrarily close by the normalized volumes of Kollár components.

Theorem 1.6. *Given an arbitrary algebraic klt singularity $o \in (X, D)$, there always exists a sequence of Kollár components $\{S_i\}$ such that*

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_{S_i}) = \inf_{v\in \mathrm{Val}(X,o)} \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(v).$$

By [Li15a, Conjecture 6.1.3], we expect v is a quasi-monomial valuation. In the future work (see [LX16]), we aim at understanding this approximation process better by giving a more precise birational model computing v (see Conjecture 6.5). We note that there is another kind of approximation of the infimum given in [Liu16, Section 4.1] (see Proposition 2.6).

The paper is organized in the following way: In Section 2, we give some necessary backgrounds. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.2, by connecting it to the infimum of $\mathrm{lct}(X, D; \mathfrak{a})^n \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a})$ for all $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideals $\mathfrak{a}$ centered on

o. We note that this latter invariant indeed has also been studied in other context. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.3. We first prove it for the cone singularity case, using heavily the ideas and calculations in [LL16]. Then we use a degeneration argument to reduce the general case to the case of cone singularities. In Section 5, by combining the normalized volume function on valuations with the local volume defined in [Ful13], and applying minimal model program, we prove Theorem 1.6 and Theorem 1.5. In Section 6, we give some examples. Guided by these examples, especially the picture of Sasakian geometry, we ask further questions for future investigation in Section 6.2.

Acknowledgement: We thank Yuchen Liu, Xiaowei Wang for helpful discussions. We especially want to thank Harold Blum and Mircea Mustaţă for pointing out a gap in an earlier draft. CL is partially supported by NSF DMS-1405936. CX is partially supported by 'The National Science Fund for Distinguished Young Scholars (11425101)'. Part of the work was done when CX visited Imperial College London. He wants to thank Paolo Cascini for the invitation and providing a wonderful environment.

2 Preliminary

Notation and Conventiones: We follow the standard notation in [Laz04a, KM98, Kol13]. A *log Fano* pair (X, D) is a projective klt pair such that $-K_X - D$ is ample.

For a local ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ and $\mathfrak{a}$ an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal, we denote by $l_R(R/\mathfrak{a})$ the length of $R/\mathfrak{a}$.

2.1 K-semistability

We say a log Fano pair (X, D) is log-K-semistable or simply K-semistable if there exists a special test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$ that degenerates (X, D) to a log Fano (X_0, D_0) with a conic Kähler-Einstein metric. Notice that this in particular implies that the generalized Futaki invariant $\mathrm{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) = 0$ (see [CDS15, Tia15]).

Our definition of K-semistability appears to be different with the standard definition in [Tia97, Don02]. It implies the standard one by [Li13] (see also [Ber15, LWX14]), and we expect they are indeed the same if we assume the Yau-Tian-Donaldson Conjecture for log Fano pairs. In particular, when X is smooth and $D = 0$, this equivalence is known by [CDS15, Tia15]. We define K-semistability in this way only because we need the following result.

Proposition 2.1. *Let (X, D) be an n-dimensional log Fano pair. If $-K_X - D \sim rH$ for some ample Cartier divisor H. Let $\bar{C}$ be the projective cone over (X, D) by H and C_D the $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor obtained by taking the cone over D. If (X, D) is log-K-semistable and assume $r \leq n+1$, then $(\bar{C}, C_D + (1-\beta)X_\infty)$ is log-K-semistable with $\beta = \frac{r}{n+1}$.*

Proof. See [LL16, Proposition 3.3]. □

Remark 2.2. *Compared to the traditional algebraic definition of K-stability, it is probably better to call this one analytic K-stability. However, we only use this analytic version in our paper, so we omit the adjective. In [Li15b], it was proved that for a cone singularity (X, o) for a Fano variety V with the polarization*

proportional to $-K_V$, if the canonical component gives a minimizer of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}$, then V is algebraically K-semistable. Conversely, it was proved in [LL16] that if V is analytically K-semistable, then the canonical component is a minimizer. We will only need the second part in this paper.

2.2 Normalized volume

Let (X, o) be a normal algebraic singularity and $v \in \mathrm{Val}_{X,o}$, which is the space of all valuations centered on o. Let $D \geq 0$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor such that $K_X + D$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. We can define the volume $\mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(v)$ and the log discrepancy $A_{X,D}(v)$ (if the context is clear, we will abbreviate it as $\mathrm{vol}(v)$ and $A(v)$) following [ELS03] and [JM12] (see e.g. [Li15a, Section 1.1]). In particular, if S is a divisor with center on X to be o, we have

$$A_{X,D}(S) := A_{X,D}(\mathrm{ord}_S) = a(S; X, D) + 1$$

the same as the standard log discrepancy.

Definition 2.3. *Notation as above. We denote the* **normalized volume** *by $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,D,o}(v)$ (or $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(v)$ if D is clear or simply $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(v)$ if there is no confusion) to be*

$$\mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(v) \cdot A^n(v)$$

if $A^n(v) < +\infty$; and $+\infty$ if $A^n(v) = +\infty$.

Recall that it was conjectured that $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(v)$ achieves the minimum at a valuation $v \in \mathrm{Val}_{X,o}$. In [Li15a], it is showed that the space

$$\{v \in \mathrm{Val}_{X,o} |\ v(\mathfrak{m}) = 1, \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(v) \leq C\}$$

for any constant $C > 0$ forms a compact set. However, in general the volume function vol is only upper continuous on $\mathrm{Val}_{X,o}$ although we expect it is continuous at a minimizer of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}$.

Proposition 2.4. *If $\{v_i\}$ is a sequence of valuations, such that $v_i \to v$ in the weakest topology, then*

$$\mathrm{vol}(v) \geq \limsup_i \mathrm{vol}(v_i).$$

Proof. The valuation v determines a sequence of graded ideas

$$\mathfrak{a}_k = \mathfrak{a}_k(v) = \{f \in R \mid v(f) \geq k\}.$$

By [Mus02], we know that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a sufficiently large k such that

$$\frac{1}{k^n}\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_k) < \mathrm{vol}(v) + \epsilon.$$

Since R is Noetherian, we know that there exist finitely many generators f_p $(1 \leq p \leq j)$ of $\mathfrak{a}_k = (f_1, ..., f_j)$. As $v(f_p) \geq k$, we know that for any δ, there exists sufficiently large i_0 such that for any $i \geq i_0$, $v_i(f_p) \geq k - \delta$. Thus

$$\mathfrak{a}^{(i)}_{k-\delta} = \{f \in R \mid v_i(f) \geq k - \epsilon\} \supset \mathfrak{a}_k.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathrm{vol}(v_i) \leq \frac{1}{(k-\delta)^n}\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}^{(i)}_{k-\epsilon}) \leq \frac{1}{(k-\delta)^n}\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_k) \leq \frac{k^n}{(k-\delta)^n}(\mathrm{vol}(v) + \epsilon).$$

□

We also have the following result. It is not needed later, but we hope it has an independent interest.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $(X, o) = (\mathrm{Spec}(R), \mathfrak{m})$ be a singularity. Let v and v' be two real valuations in $\mathrm{Val}_{X,o}$. Assume*

$$\mathrm{vol}(v) = \mathrm{vol}(v') > 0 \qquad \textit{and} \qquad v(f) \geq v'(f)$$

for any $f \in R^*$, then $v = v'$.

Proof. We prove it by contradiction. Assume this is not true, we fix $g \in R$ such that

$$v(g) = l > v'(g) = s.$$

Denote by $r = l - s > 0$. Fix $k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Consider

$$\mathfrak{a}_k := \{f \in R |\ v(f) \geq k\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathfrak{b}_k := \{f \in R |\ v'(f) \geq k\}.$$

So $\mathfrak{b}_k \subset \mathfrak{a}_k$, and we want to estimate the dimension of

$$\dim(R/\mathfrak{b}_k) - \dim(R/\mathfrak{a}_k) = \dim(\mathfrak{a}_k/\mathfrak{b}_k).$$

Fix a positive integer $m < \frac{k}{l}$ and a set

$$g_m^{(1)}, ..., g_m^{(k_m)} \in \mathfrak{b}_{k-ml}$$

whose images in $\mathfrak{b}_{k-ml}/\mathfrak{b}_{k-ml+r}$ form a $\mathbb{C}$-linear basis.

We claim that

$$\{f^m \cdot g_m^{(j)}\} \ \ (1 \leq m \leq \frac{k}{l}, 1 \leq j \leq k_m)$$

are $\mathbb{C}$-linear independent in $\mathfrak{a}_k/\mathfrak{b}_k$. Granted this for now, we know since $\mathrm{vol}(v) > 0$, then

$$\limsup_{\lim k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k^n} \sum_{1 \leq m \leq \frac{k}{l}} k_m = \limsup_{\lim k \to \infty} \sum_{1 \leq m \leq \frac{k}{l}} \frac{1}{k^n} \dim(\mathfrak{b}_{k-ml}/\mathfrak{b}_{k-ml+r}) > 0,$$

which then implies $\mathrm{vol}(v) > \mathrm{vol}(v')$.

Now we prove the claim.

Step 1: For any $1 \leq m \leq \frac{k}{l}, 1 \leq j \leq k_m$,

$$\begin{aligned} v(f^m \cdot g_m^{(j)}) &= v(f^m) + v(g_m^{(j)}) \\ &\geq ml + v'(g_m^{(j)}) \\ &\geq ml + k - ml \\ &\geq k. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $f^m \cdot g_m^{(j)} \in \mathfrak{a}_k$.

Step 2: If

$$\{f^m \cdot g_m^{(j)}\} \ \ (1 \leq m \leq \frac{k}{l}, 1 \leq j \leq k_m)$$

are not $\mathbb{C}$-linear independent in $\mathfrak{a}_k/\mathfrak{b}_k$, then there is an equality

$$\sum_m h_m = b \in \mathfrak{b}_k,$$

where there exists $c_j \in \mathbb{C}$, such that

$$h_m = f^m \cdot \sum_{1\leq j\leq k_m} c_j g_m^{(j)}$$

and some $h_m \neq 0$. Consider the maximal m, such that $h_m \neq 0$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} v'(h_m) &= v'(f^m \cdot \sum_{1\leq j\leq k_m} c_j g_m^{(j)}) \\ &= v'(f^m) + v'(\sum_{1\leq j\leq k_m} c_j g_m^{(j)}) \\ &< ms + k - ml + r \\ &= k - (m-1)l + (m-1)s, \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows from that

$$\sum_{1\leq j\leq k_m} c_j g_m^{(j)} \notin \mathfrak{b}_{k-ml+r}.$$

However, we have

$$\begin{aligned} v'(h_m) &= v'(b - \sum_{j<m} h_j) \\ &\geq \min\left\{v'(b), v'(h_1), ...v'(h_{m-1})\right\} \\ &= \min_{1\leq j\leq m-1}\{k, js + k - jl\} \\ &= k - (m-1)l + (m-1)s, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. □

Several results in our work depend on a relation between the normalized volume and some normalized multiplicity. The latter quantity was first considered in the smooth case in [dFEM04], and since then it has been studied in many other work, including positive characteristic versions (see e.g. [TW04]). Its relevance to the normalized volume appeared in [Li15a, Example 3.7]. We have the following more precise observation in [Liu16].

Proposition 2.6 ([Liu16, Section 4.1], cf. [Li15a, Example 3.7])**.** *Let $(X, o) = (\mathrm{Spec}R, \mathfrak{m})$ and $D \geq 0$ a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor, such that $o \in (X, D)$ is a klt singularity. Then we have*

$$\inf_v \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(v) = \inf_{\mathfrak{a}} \mathrm{lct}^n(X, D; \mathfrak{a}) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}), \tag{1}$$

where on the left hand side the infimum runs over all the valuations centered at o, and on the right hand side it runs over all the $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideals. Moreover, the left hand side can be replaced by $\inf_{v\in \mathrm{Div}_{X,o}} \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(v)$ where $\mathrm{Div}_{X,o}$ denotes the space of all divisorial valuations with center at o.

For the reader's convenience we provide a sketch of the proof.

Proof. We first use the same argument as in [Li15a, Example 2.7]) to prove that the left hand side is greater or equal to the right hand side. For any real valuation v, consider the graded family of valuative ideals

$$\mathfrak{a}_k = \mathfrak{a}_k(v) = \{f \in R \mid v(f) \geq k\}.$$

Then $v(\mathfrak{a}_k) \geq k$ and we can estimate:

$$A_{X,D}(v)^n \cdot \frac{\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_k)}{k^n} \quad \geq \quad \left(\frac{A_{X,D}(v)}{v(\mathfrak{a}_k)}\right)^n \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_k) \geq \mathrm{lct}^n(X, D; \mathfrak{a}_k) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_k).$$

Since for $\mathfrak{a}_\bullet = \{\mathfrak{a}_k\}$ is a graded family of $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideals on X,

$$\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) = \lim_{k\to+\infty} \frac{l_R(R/\mathfrak{a}_k)}{k^n} = \lim_{k\to+\infty} \frac{\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_k)}{k^n}.$$

(see e.g. [ELS03, Mus02, LM09, Cut12]), as $k \to +\infty$, the left hand side converges to $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(v)$ and we get one direction.

For the other direction of the inequality, we follow the argument in [Liu16]. For any $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal $\mathfrak{a}$, we can choose a divisorial valuation v calculating $\mathrm{lct}(\mathfrak{a})$. Then v is centered at o. Assume $v(\mathfrak{a}) = k$, or equivalently $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}_k(v)$. Then we have $\mathfrak{a}^l \subseteq \mathfrak{a}_k(v)^l \subseteq \mathfrak{a}_{kl}(v)$ for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. So we can estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{lct}^n(X, D; \mathfrak{a}) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}) &= \frac{A_{X,D}(v)^n}{k^n} \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}) = A_{X,D}(v)^n \cdot \frac{\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a})l^n}{(kl)^n} \\ &= A_{X,D}(v)^n \cdot \frac{\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}^l)}{(kl)^n} \geq A_{X,D}(v)^n \cdot \frac{\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_{kl})}{(kl)^n}.\end{aligned}$$

As $l \to +\infty$, then again the right hand side converges to

$$A_{X,D}(v)^n \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet(v)) = \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(v).$$

So we have proved the right-hand-side is bigger than the left-hand-side in (1).

The last statement follows easily from the above proof.

□

Proposition 2.7 (cf. [Li15b, Corollary 6.11]). *Let $\pi\colon (X, o) \to (X', o')$ be a finite morphism of degree d between n-dimension klt singularities. Let $D' \geq 0$ be an effective divisor on X' such that $K_{X'} + D'$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, and $D := \pi^* D'$.*

Let v be a valuation over (X, o) and v' the induced valuation over (X', o'). Then we have $\mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(v) = d \cdot \mathrm{vol}_{X',o'}(v)$ and $A_{X,D}(v) = A_{X',D'}(v)$. In particular,

$$d \cdot \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X',o'}(v') = \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(v).$$

Proof. First we claim that $A_{X,D}(v) = A_{X',D'}(v')$. To verify the claim, we just follow exactly the argument of [JM12, Proposition 5.13(ii)] (see also [KM98, Proposition 5.20] and [Li15b, Lemma 6.10]). By [KM98, Proposition 5.20], the claim is true for divisorial valuations, and thus for quasi-monomial valuations. Then as in the proof of [JM12, Proposition 5.13(ii)], we can similarly see $\rho : V \to V'$ is open onto its image, where $V \subset \mathrm{Val}_{X,o}$ (resp. $V' \subset \mathrm{Val}_{X',o'}$) is the subset of valuations v with $v(\mathfrak{m}) = 1$ (resp. $v(\mathfrak{m}') = 1$.). This implies for general valuations $A_{X,D}(v) = A_{X',D'}(v')$.

Denote by $R' \to R$ the finite ring morphism which is of degree d. Let $e_1, ..., e_d \in R'$, such that the R'-module morphism

$$f\colon \bigoplus_{i=1}^{d} R' \to R, \qquad (r_1, ..., r_d) \to \sum_{i=1}^{d} r_i \cdot e_i$$

induces an isomorphism after tensoring with the fraction field $K(R')$. Let

$$gr_v(R) := \bigoplus R_k \qquad (\text{resp } gr_{v'}(R') := \bigoplus R'_k)$$

be the graded ring induced by R (resp R') and the valuation v (resp R'). Assume $v(e_i) = h_i$. Thus we easily see

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{vol}(v) &= \lim_{k\to+\infty} \frac{l_R(R_k)}{k^{n-1}/(n-1)!} \\ &= \lim_{k\to+\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{l_{R'}(R'_{k-h_i})}{k^{n-1}/(n-1)!} \\ &= d \cdot \mathrm{vol}(v'), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we use the fact that $\mathrm{Ker}(f)$ and $\mathrm{Coker}(f)$ are modules of lower dimensions. □

2.3 Properties of Kollár component

The concept of *Kollár component* is defined in Definition 1.1. It always exists (cf. see [Pro00] or [Xu14, Lemma 1]). In this section, we establish some of their properties using the machinery of the minimal model program.

The following statement is the local analogue of [LX14, Theorem 1.6], which can be also easily obtained by following the proof of the existence of Kollár component. (See e.g. the proof of [Xu14].)

Proposition 2.8. *Let $o \in (X, D)$ be a klt singularlty. Let $\mu\colon Y \to X$ be a model, such that μ is an isomorphism over $X \setminus \{o\}$ and $(Y, E + \mu_*^{-1}D)$ is dlt where E is the divisorial part of $\mu^{-1}(o)$. Then we can choose a model $W \to Y$ and run MMP to obtain $W \dashrightarrow Y'$, such that $Y' \to X$ gives a Kollár component S with $a(Y, E; S) = -1$.*

We also have the following straightforward lemma.

Lemma 2.9. *If S is a Kollár component, then $\mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{ord}_S) = (-S|_S)^{n-1}$ and $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_S) = (-(K_Y + S + \mu_*^{-1}D)|_S)^{n-1} \cdot A_{X,D}(S)^n$.*

Proof. For any $k \geq 0$, we have an exact sequence,

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_Y(-(k+1)S) \to \mathcal{O}_Y(-kS) \to \mathcal{O}_S(-kS) \to 0.$$

Because $-S$ is ample over X, we have the vanishing

$$R^1 f_*(\mathcal{O}_Y(-(k+1)S)) = 0,$$

from which we get

$$H^0(S, -kS|_S) \cong \frac{H^0(Y, -kS)}{H^0(Y, -(k+1)S)} = \frac{\mathfrak{a}_k(\mathrm{ord}_S)}{\mathfrak{a}_{k+1}(\mathrm{ord}_S)}.$$

So we get the identity:

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X,o}/\mathfrak{a}_m(\mathrm{ord}_S)\right) \quad = \quad \sum_{k=0}^{m-1}\dim H^0(S,-kS|_S).$$

Then the result follows easily from the Hirzebruch-Riemann-Roch formula.

As $K_Y + S + \mu_* D \sim_{\mathbb{Q},X} A_{X,D}(S)\cdot S$, the second identity is implied by the first statement. □

Remark 2.10. *Inspired by the above simple calculation, we indeed can extend the definition of normalized volumes to any model $f : Y \to (X, o)$, such that f is isomorphic over $X \setminus \{o\}$. See Section 5.*

Lemma 2.11. *Let $f\colon (X', o') \to (X, o)$ be a finite morphism, such that $f^*(K_X + D) = K_{X'} + D'$ for some effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors. We assume (X, D) and (X', D') are klt. If S is a Kollár component given by $Y \to X$ over o, then $Y \times_X X' \to X'$ induces a Kollár component S' over $o' \in (X', D')$. Conversely, any Kollár component S' over $o \in (X', D')$ is the pull back from a Kollár component over $o \in (X, D)$.*

Proof. The first part is standard. In fact, denote by $S' = f^{-1}(S)$, then (Y', S') is log canonical, such that if we restrict to T a component of S',

$$(K_{Y'} + \mu_*'^{-1}D' + S')|_T = K_T + \Delta_T,$$

then (T, Δ_T) is klt, which by Kollár-Shokurov connectedness theorem implies that $T = S'$.

To prove the second part, we can use what we have proved to pass to a finite cover of (X', o') and assume $X' \to X$ is Galois with the Galois group G. Let

$$L \sim_{X'} -m(K_{Y'} + \mu_*'^{-1}D' + E')$$

be a divisor of general position for sufficiently divisible m and $H := \frac{1}{m}L$, then $(Y', E' + \mu_*'^{-1}D' + H)$ is plt. Replacing H by $H_G := \frac{1}{|G|}(\sum_{g\in G} g^*H)$, we know that $(X', D' + \mu_* H_G)$ is G-invariant, and there exists a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $H_X \geq 0$, such that

$$f^*(K_X + D + H_X) = K_{X'} + D' + \mu_* H_G.$$

Therefore, $(X, D + H_X)$ is plt, and its unique log canonical place is a divisor S which is a Kollár component over $o \in (X, D)$ whose pull back gives the Kollár component S' over $o' \in (X', D')$. □

2.4 Deformation to cone

Let $(X, o) = (\mathrm{Spec}(R), \mathfrak{m})$ be an algebraic singularity such that (X, D) is klt for a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $D \geq 0$. Let S be a Kollár component and $\Delta = \Delta_S$ be the different divisor defined by adjunction $(K_Y + S + \mu_*^{-1}D)|_S = K_S + \Delta_S$ where $Y \to X$ is the extraction of S. Denote $v_0 := \mathrm{ord}_S$ and

$$T = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{+\infty} \mathfrak{a}_k(v_0)/\mathfrak{a}_{k+1}(v_0) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{+\infty} T_k$$

and the d-th truncation

$$T^{(d)} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{+\infty} \mathfrak{a}_{dk}(v_0)/\mathfrak{a}_{dk+1}(v_0) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{+\infty} T_{dk} \qquad \text{for } d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Now we give a more geometric description of $\mathrm{Spec}(T)$ and $\mathrm{Spec}(T^{(d)})$ using the idea of degenerating $o \in (X, D)$ to an (orbifold) cone over the Kollár component S. Assume $\mu\colon Y \to X$ is the extraction of the Kollár component S of (X, o). Then $\mu_{\mathbb{A}^1}\colon Y \times \mathbb{A}^1 \to X \times \mathbb{A}^1$ has the exceptional divisor $S \times \mathbb{A}^1$. The divisor S is not necessarily Cartier, but only $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. Thus we can take the index 1 covering Deligne-Mumford stack $\pi : \mathcal{Y} \to Y$ for S. So π is isomorphic over $Y \setminus S$ and $\pi^*(S) = \mathcal{S}$ is Cartier on $\mathcal{Y}$.

We consider the deformation to the normal cone construction for $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{Y}$. More precisely, we consider the blow up $\pi_1 : \mathcal{Z} \to \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{A}^1$ along $\mathcal{S} \times \{0\}$. Denote by E the exceptional divisor of π_1 and by $\mathcal{T}$ the strict transform of $\mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{A}^1$. We note that E has a stacky structure along the 0 and ∞ section, but a scheme structure at other places. Then $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{Z}$ is a Cartier divisor which is proper over $\mathbb{A}^1$ and can be contracted to a normal Deligne-Mumford stack $\Psi_1\colon \mathcal{Z} \to \mathcal{W}$ and in this way we get a flat family $\mathcal{W} \to \mathbb{A}^1$ such that $\mathcal{W}_t \cong X$ and $\mathcal{W}_0 \cong \bar{\mathcal{C}} \cup \mathcal{Y}_0$, where $\mathcal{Y}_0$ is the birational transform of $Y \times \{0\}$. To understand $\mathcal{C}$ if we denote by $\mathcal{Z}^0 := \mathcal{Z} \setminus \mathcal{Y}_0$, then the fiber $\mathcal{Z}^0$ over 0 is isomorphic to $\mathcal{C}$ which is an affine orbifold cone over $\mathcal{S}$ with the polarization given by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}(-\mathcal{S})|_{\mathcal{S}}$. Moreover, $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ is the projective orbifold cone completing $\mathcal{C}$.

Let d be a positive integer such that $d \cdot S$ is Cartier in Y, then $\mathcal{C}^{(d)}$ given by the cone over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}(-d \cdot \mathcal{S})|_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a degree d cyclic quotient of $\mathcal{C}$, which is a usual ($\mathbb{A}^1$-)cone over $\mathcal{S}$. We denote by C and $C^{(d)}$ the underlying coarse moduli space of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{(d)}$. We also denote S to be the coarse moduli space of $\mathcal{S}$.

Applying the exact sequence,

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_Y(-(k+1)S) \to \mathcal{O}_Y(-kS) \to \mathcal{O}_S(-kS) \to 0,$$

since $h^1(\mathcal{O}_Y(-(k+1)S)) = 0$ by the Grauert-Riemenschneider vanishing theorem, we get:

$$H^0(S, \mathcal{O}(-kS|_S)) \cong H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(-kS))/H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(-(k+1)S)).$$

Notice that the right hand side is equal to:

$$\frac{\mu_*\mathcal{O}_Y(-kS)}{\mu_*\mathcal{O}_Y(-(k+1)S)} = \frac{\mathfrak{a}_k(v_0)}{\mathfrak{a}_{k+1}(v_0)}.$$

In particular, $C = \mathrm{Spec}(T)$. Similarly, $C^{(d)} = \mathrm{Spec}(T^{(d)})$.

There is also a degree d cyclic quotient morphism $h\colon C \to C^{(d)}$, and we know that

$$h^*(K_{\bar{C}^{(d)}} + C_\Delta^{(d)} + C_D^{(d)}) = K_{\bar{C}} + C_D,$$

where C_D is the intersection of $\bar{C}$ with the birational transform of $D \times \mathbb{A}^1$ and $C_\Delta^{(d)}$ (resp. $C_D^{(d)}$) on $\bar{C}^{(d)}$ is the induced cone over the branched $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on S of $\mathcal{S} \to S$ (resp. $\mu_*^{-1}D|_S$). In particular, $C_\Delta^{(d)} + C_D^{(d)}$ is the cone over Δ_S.

Proposition 2.12. *Let S and $S^{(d)}$ be the divisors corresponding to the canonical blow up of the projective cones $\bar{C}$ and $\bar{C}^{(d)}$. Then $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{(\bar{C}, C_D)}$ minimizes at ord_S if and only if $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{(\bar{C}^{(d)}, C_\Delta^{(d)} + C_D^{(d)})}$ minimizes at $\mathrm{ord}_{S^{(d)}}$. Furthermore, S is the*

unique minimizer among all Kollár components for $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{(\bar{C},C_\Delta)}$ *if and only if the same holds for* $\bar{C}^{(d)}$ *on* $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{(\bar{C}^{(d)},C_\Delta^{(d)}+C_D^{(d)})}$.

Proof. Notice that there is a restriction map $\mathrm{Val}_{\bar{C}} \to \mathrm{Val}_{\bar{C}^{(d)}}$ induced by the natural embedding $\mathbb{C}(\bar{C}^{(d)}) \to \mathbb{C}(\bar{C})$. In particular, ord_S is mapped to $d\cdot\mathrm{ord}_{S^{(d)}}$. This map is surjective by [EP05, Section 3.1], thus any valuation $v^{(d)} \in \mathrm{Val}_{\bar{C}^{(d)}}$ can be extended to a valuation $v \in \mathrm{Val}_{\bar{C}}$. On the other hand, we have

$$h^*(K_{\bar{C}^{(d)}} + C_\Delta^{(d)} + C_D^{(d)}) = K_{\bar{C}} + C_\Delta.$$

Now the two statements follow easily from 2.7 and 2.11. □

3 K-semistability implies minimum

Let $(X,o) = (\mathrm{Spec}(R),\mathfrak{m})$ be an algebraic singularity such that (X,D) is klt for a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $D \geq 0$. Denote by $\mathfrak{m}$ the maximal ideal of $o \in X$. Suppose $\mathfrak{b}$ is an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal on X. We consider its flat degeneration $W/\mathbb{A}^1$ where W is the underlying coarse moduli space of $\mathcal{W}$ defined in Section 2.4. We keep the notation in Section 2.4 and denote by v_0 the valuation ord_S.

Next we will describe explicitly a way of obtaining an ideal $\mathfrak{B}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathfrak{B}\otimes\mathcal{O}_{X\times\mathbb{C}^*} = \mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathfrak{B}\otimes\mathcal{O}_C \cong \mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b})$ by considering the closure of $\mathfrak{b}\times\mathbb{C}^*$ on the pull back $\mathcal{Z}$.

For this we consider the extended Rees algebra (see [Eis94, 6.5]):

$$\mathcal{R}' = \bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{R}'_k := \bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{a}_k t^{-k} \subset R[t,t^{-1}].$$

Notice that if $k \leq 0$, then $\mathfrak{a}_k = R$. It is well known that:

$$\mathcal{R}'\otimes_{\mathbb{C}[t]}\mathbb{C}[t,t^{-1}] \cong R[t,t^{-1}], \quad \mathcal{R}'\otimes_{\mathbb{C}[t]}\mathbb{C}[t]/(t) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{+\infty}(\mathfrak{a}_k/\mathfrak{a}_{k+1})t^{-k} \cong T.$$

Geometrically this exactly means $W = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{R}')$ and

$$W\times_{\mathbb{A}^1}(\mathbb{A}^1\setminus\{0\}) = X\times(\mathbb{A}^1\setminus\{0\}), \quad W\times_{\mathbb{A}^1}\{0\} = C.$$

Notice that there is a natural $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathcal{R}'$ given by the $\mathbb{Z}$-grading.

For any $f \in R$, supposing $v_0(f) = k$ then we define

$$\tilde{f} = t^{-k}f \in \mathfrak{a}_k t^{-k} \subset \mathcal{R}',$$

and denote

$$\mathbf{in}(f) = [f] = [f]_{\mathfrak{a}_{k+1}} \in \mathfrak{a}_k/\mathfrak{a}_{k+1} = T_k,$$

where we use $[f]_{\mathfrak{a}}$ to denote the image of f in $R/\mathfrak{a}$. Then we define the ideal $\mathfrak{B}$ to be the ideal in $\mathcal{R}'$ generated by $\{\tilde{f}; f\in\mathfrak{b}\}$, and $\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b})$ the ideal of T generated by $\{\mathbf{in}(f); f\in\mathfrak{b}\}$. The first two items of the following lemma is similar to (but not the same as) [Eis94, Theorem 15.17] and should be well known to experts. Notice that here we degenerate both the ambient space and the ideal. A version of the equality (2) was proved in [Li15b, Proposition 4.3].

Lemma 3.1. *1. There are the identities:*

$$(\mathcal{R}'/\mathfrak{B})\otimes_{\mathbb{C}[t]}\mathbb{C}[t,t^{-1}] \cong (R/\mathfrak{b})[t,t^{-1}], \quad (\mathcal{R}'/\mathfrak{B})\otimes_{k[t]}k[t]/(t) \cong T/\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}).$$

2. *The $\mathbb{C}[t]$-algebra $\mathcal{R}'/\mathfrak{B}$ is free and thus flat as a $\mathbb{C}[t]$-module. In particular, we have the identity of dimensions:*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(R/\mathfrak{b}) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(T/\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b})). \tag{2}$$

3. *If $\mathfrak{b}$ is $\mathfrak{m}_R$-primary, then $\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b})$ is an $\mathfrak{m}_T$-primary homogeneous ideal.*

Proof. The statement (1) follows easily from the definition.

Next we prove (2). Denote by $\mathfrak{c}_k = T_k \cap \mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b})$ the k-th homogeneous piece of $\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b})$. We fix a basis $\left\{\mathbf{in}(f_i^{(k)}); 1 \le i \le d_k\right\}$ of $T_k/\mathfrak{c}_k$. We want to show that

$$\mathcal{A}' := \left\{ \left[\widetilde{f_i^{(k)}}\right] = \left[f_i^{(k)}\right]_{\mathfrak{B}} \;\middle|\; 1 \le i \le d_k \right\} \subset \mathcal{R}'/\mathfrak{B}$$

is a $\mathbb{C}[t]$-basis of $\mathcal{R}'/\mathfrak{B}$.

We first verify that $\mathcal{A}'$ is a linearly independent set. To prove this, we just need to show that $\mathcal{A}'$ is a $\mathbb{C}[t,t^{-1}]$-linearly independent subset of $(R/\mathfrak{b})[t,t^{-1}]$. It is then enough to show that

$$\mathcal{A} := \left\{ [f_i^{(k)}] = [f_i^{(k)}]_{\mathfrak{b}} \mid 1 \le i \le d_k \right\} \subset R/\mathfrak{b}. \tag{3}$$

is $\mathbb{C}$-linearly independent, which can be verified directly as in [Li15b, Proposition 4.3]. See also [Eis94, Proposition 15.3].

So we just need to show that $\mathcal{A}'$ spans $\mathcal{R}'/\mathfrak{B}$. Equivalently, we need to show that for any $f \in R$, $[\tilde{f}] = [\tilde{f}]_{\mathfrak{B}} \in \mathcal{R}'/\mathfrak{B}$ is in the $\mathbb{C}[t]$-span of $\mathcal{A}'$. This can be shown again with the help of $\mathcal{A}$ in (3), that is, it is enough to prove that $\mathcal{A}$ $\mathbb{C}$-spans $R/\mathfrak{b}$. Indeed, assuming the latter, for any $f \in R$, there exists a linear combination $g = \sum_{i,k} c_{ik} f_i^{(k)}$ such that $f - g =: h \in \mathfrak{b}$. If $m = v_0(f)$, then

$$\tilde{f} = t^{-m} f = \sum_{i,k} c_{ik} t^{-m} f_i^{(k)} + t^{-m} h$$

Because $t^{-m}h \in \mathfrak{B}$, the above indeed implies $[\tilde{f}]$ is in the $\mathbb{C}[t]$-span of $\mathcal{A}'$.

To prove that $\mathcal{A}$ indeed $\mathbb{C}$-spans $R/\mathfrak{b}$, we first claim that the following set is finite:

$$\{v_0(g) \mid g \in R - \mathfrak{b}\}.$$

Indeed because $\mathfrak{b}$ is $\mathfrak{m}$-primary, there exists $N > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{m}^N \subseteq \mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$. So $R - \mathfrak{b} \subseteq R - \mathfrak{m}^N$. Now the claim follows from the fact that for any element $f \in \mathfrak{m}^N$,

$$v_0(f) \le c \cdot A(v_0) \cdot N$$

by Izumi's theorem, where c is a uniform constant not depending on f.

If there is $[f] \neq 0 \in R/\mathfrak{b}$ that is not in the span of $\mathcal{A}$, then we can choose a maximal $k = v_0(f)$ such that this happens. There are two cases:

1. If $\mathbf{in}(f) \in T_k \setminus \mathfrak{c}_k$, then because $\mathbf{in}(f_i^{(k)})$ is a basis of $T_k/\mathfrak{c}_k$, there exists $t_j \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbf{in}(f) - \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} t_j \mathbf{in}(f_j^{(k)}) = \mathbf{in}(g) \in \mathfrak{c}_k$ for some $g \in \mathfrak{b}$. So we get:

$$v_0\left(f - \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} t_j f_j^{(k)} - g\right) > k.$$

By maximality of k, $[f - \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} t_j f_j^{(k)} - g] = [f] - \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} t_j [f_j^{(k)}]$ and hence $[f]$ is in the span of $\mathcal{A}$. Contradiction.

2. If $\mathbf{in}(f) \in \mathfrak{c}_k = \mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}) \cap T_k$. Then $\mathbf{in}(f) = \mathbf{in}(g)$ for some $g \in \mathfrak{b}$. So $v_0(f-g) > k$ and hence $[f-g]$ is in the span of $\mathcal{A}$ by the maximal property of k. But then $[f] = [f-g] + [g] = [f-g]$ is in the span of $\mathcal{A}$. Contradiction.

To prove part 3 of the Lemma, we need to show that there exists $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $\mathfrak{m}_T^N \subseteq \mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_T$. Because $\mathfrak{b}$ is $\mathfrak{m}_R$ primary, there exists $N_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $\mathfrak{m}_R^{N_1} \subseteq \mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_R$. By Izumi's theorem, there exists $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $\mathfrak{a}_{lm} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_R^m$ for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. By letting $N = lN_1$, it's easy to see that $\mathfrak{m}_T^N \subseteq \mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_T$.

□

Lemma 3.2. *If $\mathfrak{b}_\bullet = \{\mathfrak{b}_k\}$ is a graded family of ideals of R, then $\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet) := \{\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_k)\}$ is also a graded family of ideals of T.*

Proof. We need to show that:

$$\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_k) \cdot \mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_l) \subseteq \mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_{k+l}).$$

If $v_0(f) = k$ and $v_0(g) = l$, then $v_0(fg) = k + l$.

$$\mathbf{in}(f) \cdot \mathbf{in}(g) = [f]_{\mathfrak{a}_{k+1}} \cdot [g]_{\mathfrak{a}_{l+1}} = [fg]_{\mathfrak{a}_{k+l+1}} = \mathbf{in}(f \cdot g).$$

□

Lemma 3.3. *If $\mathfrak{b}_\bullet$ is a graded family of ideals, then*

$$\mathrm{lct}^n(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet) \geq \mathrm{lct}^n(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet)) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet)). \tag{4}$$

Proof. By the flatness of $\mathfrak{B}$ and the lower semicontinuity of log canonical thresholds, we have $\mathrm{lct}(\mathfrak{b}_k) \geq \mathrm{lct}(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_k))$. Therefore, by (2)

$$\mathrm{lct}^n(\mathfrak{b}_k) \cdot l_R(R/\mathfrak{b}_k) \quad \geq \quad \mathrm{lct}^n(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_k)) \cdot l_T(T/\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_k)).$$

Dividing both sides by $k^n/n!$ and taking limits as $k \to +\infty$, we then get the inequality (4). □

We also have

Lemma 3.4. *If (S, Δ_S) is K-semistable, then we have*

$$\mathrm{lct}^n(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet)) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet)) \geq \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{C,C_\Delta,o}(\mathrm{ord}_S).$$

Proof. Since $\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet)$ is a graded sequence of $\mathfrak{m}_0$-primary ideals, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{lct}^n(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet)) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet)) &= \lim_{k\to+\infty} \left(k \cdot \mathrm{lct}(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_k))\right)^n \cdot \frac{\mathrm{mult}(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_k))}{k^n} \\ &= \lim_{k\to+\infty} \mathrm{lct}^n(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_k)) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_k)). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2.6, it suffices to show that $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{C,C_\Delta,o}(\mathrm{ord}_S)$ is equal to

$$\min_v \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{C,C_\Delta,o}(v)$$

for v runs over valuations centered on o. By Proposition 2.12, we can replace C by $C^{(d)}$. Therefore we may choose d sufficiently divisible, such that $C^{(d)} = C(S, H)$ is constructed as the cone over S with some ample Cartier divisor H proportional to $-(K_S + \Delta_S)$. Then this follows from [LL16]. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. With the notation as in Section 2.4, we denote by $\mathcal{D}$ the birational transform of $D \times \mathbb{A}^1$ on $\mathcal{Z}^0$ and write $a\mathcal{T} \sim_{\mathbb{Q},\mathcal{X}} K_{\mathcal{Z}^0} + \mathcal{T}$. Restricting over a general fiber and taking the coarse moduli spaces, we obtain

$$aS \sim_{X,\mathbb{Q}} K_Y + S + \mu_*^{-1}(D),$$

then $a = A_{X,D}(S)$. Similarly, over the central fiber over 0, we get

$$aS_0 \sim_{X,\mathbb{Q}} K_{Y_0} + S_0 + \mu_{0,*}^{-1} C_D,$$

thus $a = A_{C,C_D}(S_0)$, where $\mu_0 \colon Y_0 \to C$ is the blow up of the vertex with the exceptional divisor S_0.

We also know that

$$\mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(\mathrm{ord}_S) = (-S|_S)^{n-1} = (-S_0|_{S_0})^{n-1} = \mathrm{vol}_{C,p}(\mathrm{ord}_{S_0}).$$

Combining all the above, we know that for any ideal $\mathfrak{b}$ on X, if we let $\mathfrak{b}_\bullet = \{\mathfrak{b}^k\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(\mathrm{ord}_S) &= \mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(\mathrm{ord}_S) \cdot A_{X,D}^n(S) \\
&= \mathrm{vol}_{C,p}(\mathrm{ord}_{S_0}) \cdot A_{C,C_D}^n(S_0) \\
&= \inf_v \mathrm{vol}_{C,p}(\mathrm{ord}_v) \cdot A_{C,C_D}^n(v) \\
&\leq \mathrm{lct}^n(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet)) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet)) \\
&\leq \mathrm{lct}^n(\mathfrak{b}) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{b}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last two inequalities follow from Lemma 3.3 and 3.4. Thus we conclude that

$$\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(\mathrm{ord}_S) \leq \inf_{\mathfrak{b}} \mathrm{lct}^n(\mathfrak{b}) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{b}) = \inf_v \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(v),$$

where the second equality follows from Proposition 2.6. □

4 Uniqueness

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.3 about the uniqueness of the minimizers among all Kollár components. There are two steps: first we prove this for cone singularities; then for a general singularity, we combine the deformation construction with some results from the minimal model program to essentially reduce it to the case of cone singularities.

4.1 Case of cone singularity


Let (V, Δ) be a log Fano variety and $-(K_V + \Delta) = rH$ for an ample Cartier divisor H. Assume $X^0 := C(V, H)$ is the affine cone over the base V with vertex o and let X be the projective cone and D be the cone divisor over Δ on X. In the below, for a variety $\bullet$, we denote the product $\bullet \times \mathbb{A}^1$ by $\bullet_{\mathbb{A}^1}$.

Consider a Kollár component S over $o \in (X, D)$ with the extraction morphism $\mu \colon Y \to X$. Let

$$\mu_{\mathbb{A}^1} (= \mu \times \mathrm{id}) \colon Y_{\mathbb{A}^1} \to X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$$

be the extraction of $S_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. We carry out the deformation process in Section 2.4 with respect to S. Here X is a projective variety instead of a local singularity,

but the construction is exactly the same. We denote by Z (resp. W) the coarse moduli space of $\mathcal{Z}$ (resp. $\mathcal{W}$), so there are morphisms, $\psi_1 : Z \to W$, $\phi_1 \colon Z \to Y_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ and $\pi \colon W \to X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. We denote by $\phi = \mu_{\mathbb{A}^1} \circ \phi_1$.



Then we have the following equalities:

1. $K_{Y_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + (\mu_{\mathbb{A}^1})_*^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{A}^1}) = \mu_{\mathbb{A}^1}^*(K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1}) + aS_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ with $a = A_{X,D}(S) - 1$;
2. $K_Z + \phi_*^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{A}^1}) = \phi_1^*\big(K_{Y_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + (\mu_{\mathbb{A}^1})_*^{-1} D_{\mathbb{A}^1}\big) + \mathcal{F}$;
3. $K_Z + \phi_*^{-1} D_{\mathbb{A}^1} = \psi_1^*\big(K_W + (D_{\mathbb{A}^1})_W\big) + aS_{\mathbb{A}^1}$, where $(D_{\mathbb{A}^1})_W := \psi_{1*}\phi_*^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{A}^1})$.

The first two equalities imply:

$$\begin{aligned} K_Z + \phi_*^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{A}^1}) &= \phi_1^*\big(K_{Y_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + (\mu_{\mathbb{A}^1})_*^{-1} D_{\mathbb{A}^1}\big) + \mathcal{F} \\ &= \phi_1^*\mu_{\mathbb{A}^1}^*(K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1}) + a\phi_1^* S_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{F} \\ &= \phi^*(K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1}) + aS_{\mathbb{A}^1} + (a+1)\mathcal{F}. \end{aligned}$$

So $A_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, D_{\mathbb{A}^1}}(\mathcal{F}) = a + 2 = A_{X,D}(S) + 1$. This implies:

$$K_W + (D_{\mathbb{A}^1})_W = \pi^* K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, D_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + A_{X,D}(S)\bar{C}.$$

Recall that $-K_X - D = (1+r)L$, where $L = \mathcal{O}(1)$ for the cone construction, so we get:

$$K_W + (D_{\mathbb{A}^1})_W = -(1+r)\rho^* L + A_{X,D}(S)\bar{C},$$

where $\rho \colon W \to X$ the composite of $\pi \colon W \to X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ with the first projection $X_{\mathbb{A}^1} \to X$.

Remark 4.1. *1. As in [LL16], we define the cone angle parameter $\beta = \frac{r}{n}$. Denote by V_∞ the section at infinite place of X and $\mathbb{V}_\infty$ the birational transform of $(V_\infty)_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Then*

$$-(K_X + D + (1-\beta)V_\infty) = \delta L$$

with $\delta = r\frac{1+n}{n}$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & K_W + (D_{\mathbb{A}^1})_W + (1-\beta)\mathbb{V}_\infty & (5) \\ = \; & \pi^*\big(K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + (1-\beta)\mathbb{V}_\infty\big) + A_{X,D}(S)\bar{C} \\ = \; & -\delta\rho^* L + A_{X,D}(S)\bar{C}. & (6) \end{aligned}$$

2. *Because* $K_Y + \mu_*^{-1}D = \mu^*(K_X + D) + (A_{X,D}(S) - 1)S$, *we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} K_Y + \mu_*^{-1}D + (1-\beta)V_\infty &= \mu^*\big(K_X + D + (1-\beta)V_\infty\big) + (A_{X,D}(S) - 1)S \\ &= -\delta\mu^* L + (A_{X,D}(S) - 1)S. \end{aligned}$$

The above construction works for any Kollár component. From now on we assume that (V, Δ) is K-semistable and S minimizes the normalized volume, i.e. it satisfies

$$\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_S) = \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_{V_0}) = r^n(H^{n-1}), \tag{7}$$

where V_0 denotes the canonical divisor obtained by blowing up the vertex of the cone and we aim to show $S = V$ is the canonical component. We note that by [LL16], we know that $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_{V_0})$ is the minimal normalized volume.

Then we have:

$$\mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{ord}_S) = \frac{\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_S)}{A_{X,D}(S)^n} = \frac{r^n(H^{n-1})}{A_{X,D}(S)^n}.$$

We recall the following notions of filtrations (see [BHJ15, Fuj15]):

Definition 4.2 (Filtration by valuation)**.** *Fixed a valuation* v*. Let* $S_m = H^0(X, L^{\otimes m})$*. Define* $\mathcal{F}^x S_m \subset S_m$ *to be a decreasing filtration (with respect to* x*) as follows:*

$$\mathcal{F}^x S_m := H^0(X, L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathfrak{a}_x), \qquad \text{where } \mathfrak{a}_x = \{f \in \mathcal{O}_X \mid v(f) \geq x\}.$$

On $\bigoplus_{m=0} S_m$*, we define* $\mathcal{F}S^{(t)} = \bigoplus \mathcal{F}^{kt} S_k$*. Then the volume is defined to be*

$$\mathrm{vol}(\mathcal{F}S^{(t)}) := \limsup_{m\to\infty} \frac{\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{F}^{mt} S_m}{m^n/n!}.$$

The key calculation is the following results which are proved in in [LL16].

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose* (V, Δ) *is log-K-semistable. If* S *is a Kollár obtaining the minimum of* $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}$ *over* (X, o)*, then the graded filtration induced by* S *satisfies the following two conditions:*

1. $$A_{X,D}(S) - \frac{\delta}{(L^n)} \int_0^{+\infty} \mathrm{vol}(\mathcal{F}S^{(x)})dx = 0.$$

2. *Denote* $\tau := \sqrt[n]{\frac{(L^n)}{\mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{ord}_S)}}$*. We have:*

$$\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{F}S^{(x)}\right) = \mathrm{vol}_Y(\mu^* L - xS) = (L^n) - \mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{ord}_S)x^n \text{ for any } x \in [0, \tau].$$

Proof. This is precisely the equality case of the Formula (25) and (29) in [LL16]. □

See Lemma 4.8 for an interpretation of the left hand side appearing in Proposition 4.3.1.

Lemma 4.4. *We have* $\tau = \frac{A_{X,D}(S)}{r}$.

Proof. Combining 1 and 2 in Proposition 4.3, we know that

$$A_{X,D}(S) - \frac{r(1+n)}{n \cdot L^n} \int_0^\tau \big(L^n - \mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{ord}_S)x^n\big)dx = A_{X,D}(S) - r \cdot \tau = 0.$$

□

By arguing as in [Fuj15] (see also [Liu16]), we know that:

Lemma 4.5. *We know τ is the nef threshold, i.e.*

$$\tau = \sup\{x|\ \mu_{\mathbb{A}^1}^* L - xS \text{ is ample }\}.$$

Proof. When the point is smooth, this follows from [Fuj15, Theorem 2.3(2)]. Exactly the same argument can be used to treat the current case. □

Theorem 4.6. *If S is a Kollár component obtaining the minimum of the normalized volume, then S is the canonical component V_0.*

We first show the following statements.

Lemma 4.7. *1. $\rho^* L - \tau\bar{C}$ is base-point-free, and contracts Y to $S_\infty (\cong S) \subset \bar{C}$ as the section at the infinite place.*

2. $A_{X,D}(S) = r$ and there is a special test configuration degenerating (V, Δ) into (E, Δ_E). Moreover, there is a special test configuration of $(X, D + (1-\beta)V_\infty; L)$ to $(\bar{C}, D_{\bar{C}} + (1-\beta)S_\infty; \mathcal{L}_0)$ which is indeed an isomorphism, where $D_{\bar{C}}$ is the intersection of $\bar{C}$ with $(D \times \mathbb{A}^1)_W$.

Proof. The proof of this part is along the same line the proof of [Liu16, Lemma 33]. First we observe the following restrictions of $\rho^* L - x\bar{C}$:

1. $\rho^* L - x\bar{C}\big|_{X_t} = L$, $t \neq 0$;
2. $\rho^* L - x\bar{C}\big|_{Y_0} = \mu^* L - xS$;
3. $\rho^* L - x\bar{C}\big|_{\bar{C}} = -x\bar{C}|_{\bar{C}} = xY_0|_{\bar{C}} = xS_\infty = x\mathcal{O}_{\bar{C}}(1)$.

So by Lemma 4.5, it is easy to see that $\rho^* L - x\bar{C}$ is ample when $x \in (0, \tau)$. To show that $\rho^* L - \tau\bar{C}$ is base-point-free, we calculate by using (5):

$$\begin{aligned} m(\rho^* L - x\bar{C}) - K_W - (D_{\mathbb{A}^1})_W &= m(\rho^* L - x\bar{C}) + (1+r)\rho^* L - A_{X,D}(S)\bar{C} \\ &= (m+1+r)\left(\rho^* L - \frac{mx + A_{X,D}(S)}{m+1+r}\bar{C}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that:

$$\frac{mx + A_{X,D}(S)}{m+1+r} < \tau = \frac{A_{X,D}(S)}{r}$$

if and only if

$$x < \left(1 + \frac{1}{m}\right)\frac{A_{X,D}(S)}{r}.$$

Because this is satisfied for

$$x = \tau = \frac{A_{X,D}(S)}{r} \qquad \text{for any } m > 0,$$

the first statement holds by base-point-free theorem [KM98, Theorem 3.13]. Next we claim that

$$H^0(Y, m(\mu^*L - \tau S)) \cong H^0(S, -m\tau S) \tag{8}$$

for any m sufficiently divisible. To see this, we consider the exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_Y(m(\mu^*L-\tau S)-S) \to \mathcal{O}_Y(m(\mu^*L-\tau S)) \to \mathcal{O}_Y(m(\mu^*L-\tau S))\otimes\mathcal{O}_S \to 0, \tag{9}$$

and its associated long exact sequence of cohomology groups. By the above discussion, and

$$m(\mu^*L - \tau S) - S - K_Y = m(\mu^*L - \frac{A_{X,D}(S)}{r}S) + (1+r)\mu^*L - A_{X,D}(S)S$$

is ample, it follows from the Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem that

$$H^1\big(Y, m(\mu^*L - \tau S) \otimes \mathcal{O}(-S)\big) = 0 \text{ for any } m \geq 0.$$

We also have

$$H^0\big(Y, m(\mu^*L - \tau S) \otimes \mathcal{O}(-S)\big) = 0 \text{ for any } m \geq 0.$$

as τ is also the pseudo-effective threshold. Thus we know $|m(\rho^*L-\tau\bar{C})|$ contracts the fiber $W \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \{0\}$ to $\bar{C}$ for sufficiently divisible m. This finishes the proof of (1). We denote by $\theta\colon W \to \mathcal{X}$ the induced morphism and there is an ample line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\theta^*\mathcal{L} = \rho^*L - \tau\bar{C}$.

Next we prove (2). Let $(D_{\mathbb{A}^1})_{\mathcal{X}}$ be the push forward of $(D_{\mathbb{A}^1})_W$ on $\mathcal{X}$. Then $-K_{\mathcal{X}} - (D_{\mathbb{A}^1})_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $(1+r)\mathcal{L}$ coincide outside $\mathcal{X}_0$, they must be linearly equivalent on the whole $\mathcal{X}$ because $\mathcal{X}_0$ is irreducible. In particular, they are linearly equivalent when restricted to $\mathcal{X}_0$.

Since

$$(K_Y + \mu_*^{-1}D + S)|_S = K_S + \Delta_S \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} A_{X,D}(S)\cdot S|_S,$$

we know that

$$-K_{\mathcal{X}} - (D_{\mathbb{A}^1})_{\mathcal{X}}|_{\mathcal{X}_0} = -K_{\bar{C}} - D_{\bar{C}} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (1 + A_{X,D}(S))S_\infty.$$

Similarly, we have $\mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{X}_0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \tau S$ with $\tau = \frac{A_{X,D}(S)}{r}$. Therefore,

$$1 + A_{X,D}(S) = (1+r)\frac{A_{X,D}(S)}{r},$$

which implies $A_{X,D}(S) = r$ and $\tau = 1$.

The degree of V_∞ under $\mathcal{L}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}|^{n-1}_{\mathcal{X}_0} \cdot V_\infty &= L^{n-1}\cdot V_\infty \\ &= L^n, \end{aligned}$$

while the degree of S is

$$\mathcal{L}|^{n-1}_{\mathcal{X}_0} \cdot S = \tau^{-1}\mathcal{L}_0^n = L_t^n = L_0^n.$$

The restriction $\theta|_{V_\infty}\colon V_\infty \to S$ is finite since

$$(\rho^*L - \tau\bar{C})|_{V_\infty} = L|_{V_\infty}$$

is ample. And the degree is 1 by the above calculation on degrees, which implies this is an isomorphism. We claim Y is indeed the $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle over V_∞ induced by blowing up the vertex of X, S is a section and the morphism θ is just contracting the $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle. Granted this for now, we then indeed have an isomorphism from $(X, D + (1-\beta)V_\infty; L)$ to $(\bar{C}, D_{\bar{C}} + (1-\beta)S_\infty; \mathcal{L}_0)$.

To see the claim, let l be a curve contracted by θ, we want to show that it is the birational transform of a ruling line of X. To see this, since $(\rho^*(L) - \bar{C}) \cdot l = 0$, we know that $\rho^*(L) \cdot l = 1$. So the image $\rho_* l$ of l in X is a line, and it passes through the vertex. Therefore, it is a ruling of the cone.

□

By the above proof, let $\mathcal{V}$ be the birational transform of $(V_\infty)_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ on $\mathcal{X}$, and $\mathcal{H}$ the extension of $H_{\mathbb{A}^1} \setminus \{0\}$ on $\mathcal{X}$, we know that:

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{V}} \left(\bigoplus_{k=0}^{+\infty} \mathcal{S}_k \right),$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_k = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{k} (H^0(\mathcal{V}, i\mathcal{H}) \cdot u^{k-i}).$$

From this we easily see that S and V give the same component over the vertex.

To understand the geometric meaning of the left hand side of the formula in Proposition 4.3, we have the following lemma which is a direct generalization of the absolute case in [Li15b, Fuj16].

Lemma 4.8. *For the special test configuration which degenerates $(X, D + (1-\beta)V_\infty; L)$ to $(\bar{C}, C_{\bar{D}} + (1-\beta)S_\infty; \mathcal{L}_0)$, the log-CM weight is equal to*

$$A_{X,D}(S) - \frac{\delta}{(L^n)} \int_0^{+\infty} \mathrm{vol}(\mathcal{F}S^{(x)}) dx.$$

4.2 The general case

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2 in the general case. In the argument, we will use results from Section 5. We note that we do not use any result from this section in Section 5. We suggest the reader to first read Section 5, and then come back to the argument below.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We first notice that by Theorem 4.6 and Proposition 2.7, we know that for the coarse moduli space of an orbifold cone over a K-semistable log Fano pair, the only Kollár component which minimizes the normalized volume function is given by the canonical component.

Now we consider the case of a general klt singularity $o \in (X, D)$. Let us assume that there is another component F such that

$$\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_S) = \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_F),$$

in particular, they take the minimal value of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}$ by Theorem 1.2.

Let $W \to B$ be the family which degenerates X to $X_0 = Y_0 \cup \bar{C}$, where $Y_0 \cong Y$ extracting S over X and $\bar{C}$ is the the coarse moduli space of the orbifold cone over $S = \bar{C} \cap Y_0$. Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be an ideal whose normalized blow up gives the

model of extracting the Kollár component F (see the proof of Proposition 5.10). Denote the degeneration of $\{\mathfrak{a}_\bullet\} := \{\mathfrak{a}^p\}$ by $\mathfrak{b} := \{\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{a}^p)\}$ (which in general is not necessarily equal to but only contains $(\mathbf{in}(\mathfrak{a}))^p$).

Since

$$\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}) \cdot \mathrm{lct}^n(X, \mathfrak{a}) = \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_F) = \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_{S_0}) \leq \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{b}) \cdot \mathrm{lct}^n(\bar{C}, \mathfrak{b}),$$

where the last inequality is from the assumption that S_0 is K-semistable and Theorem 1.2. But $\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{b})$ and $\mathrm{lct}(X, \mathfrak{a}) \geq \mathrm{lct}(\bar{C}, \mathfrak{b})$, we know that

$$\mathrm{lct}(X, \mathfrak{a}) = \mathrm{lct}(\bar{C}, \mathfrak{b}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathrm{lct}(\bar{C}, \frac{1}{k}\mathfrak{b}_k),$$

which we denote by c. In particular, for we can choose ϵ sufficiently small, and k sufficiently large, such that the log discrepancy

$$a_l(F, X, D + (c-\epsilon)\mathfrak{a}) < 1$$

and $(C, C_D + (c-\epsilon)\frac{1}{k}\mathfrak{b}_k)$ is klt. Thus by [BCHM10] we can construct a model $Z \to W$ extracting only the irreducible divisor F_Z which gives F over the generic fiber. Furthermore, we can assume $-F_W$ is ample over W and after a base change, we can assume $F_W|_{X_0}$ is reduced.

We claim that $Z_0 \to W_0$ also only extracts a Kollár component. In fact, locally over the vertex v of $\bar{C}$, since

$$(-F_W|_X)^n = (-F_W|_{X_0})^n,$$

then by Lemma 5.6,

$$\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_F) = \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(Z_0/W_0) = \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_{S_0}).$$

Thus we conclude that the volume of the model Z_0 is equal to $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(F)$, which is equal to the minimum of the normalized volume $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{\bar{C},v}$. It follows from the argument in the proof of Theorem 1.5 that over v, $Z_0 \to W_0$ yields a Kollár component F_0. By the proof in the cone case, F_0 has to be the same as the canonical component S_0. In particular, this implies that the birational transform $\mathbb{P}$ of $\bar{C}$ in Z is the extract of the canonical component.

Thus there is a morphism $\mathbb{P} \to S$. Let l be the fiber class of $\mathbb{P} \to S$. Consider $K_Z + \mu_*^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{A}^1}) + F_Z$, which satisfies that

$$\big(K_Z + \mu_*^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{A}^1}) + F_Z\big)|_{F_0} = K_{F_0} + \Delta_{F_0}$$

is anti-ample,

$$\big(K_Z + \mu_*^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{A}^1}) + F_Z\big)|_S = K_S + \Delta_S$$

is anti-ample, and

$$\big(K_Z + \mu_*^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{A}^1}) + F_Z\big) \cdot l = 0.$$

Thus l is an extremal ray in $N_1(Z/X_{\mathbb{A}^1})$.

Hence we know that there is a morphism $Z \to W'$ which contracts $\mathbb{P}$ and W' admits a morphism $\chi\colon W' \to X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Restricting over 0, the central fiber is the birational model $\mu\colon Y \to X$ which extracts S. On the other hand, let $\mu_F\colon Y_F \to X$ be the birational model which extracts the Kollár component F.

As $Y_F \times \mathbb{A}^1$ and W' is isomorphic in codimension 1, if we denote by $F_{W'}$ the push forward of F_Z on W', we have

$$\begin{aligned} W' &= \operatorname{Proj} \bigoplus_m \mu_{1*}\mathcal{O}_{W'}\big(-mF_{W'}\big) \\ &= \operatorname{Proj} \bigoplus_m \mu_{2*}\mathcal{O}_{Y_F\times\mathbb{A}^1}\big(-m(F\times\mathbb{A}^1)\big) \\ &= Y_F \times \mathbb{A}^1. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the central fiber over 0, this implies that $Y_F = Y$. □

5 Volume of models

5.1 Local volume and volume of models

In this section, we extend the definition of volume to models in the 'normalized' sense. We use the concept of local volumes as in [ELS03, Ful13]. Let us first recall the definition, which is from [Ful13].

Definition 5.1 (Local volume)**.** *(cf. See [Ful13]) Let X be a normal algebraic variety of dimension at least two and let o be a point on X. Fixing a proper birational map $\mu\colon Y \to X$, for an arbitrary Cartier divisor D on Y, we define the local volume of D at x to be*

$$\operatorname{vol}_o^F(D) = \limsup_{m\to\infty} \frac{h_o^1(mD)}{m^n/n!},$$

where $h_o^1(mD) := \dim H^1_{\{o\}}(X, f_*\mathcal{O}_Y(mD))$.

We can define the volume of a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor D to be

$$\operatorname{vol}_o^F(D) := \frac{\operatorname{vol}_o^F(mD)}{m^n},$$

for sufficiently divisible m.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\mu\colon Y \to X$ be a birational morphism. If $D \geq 0$ is an exceptional $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor, such that $\operatorname{Supp}(D) \subset \mu^{-1}(o)$. Then*

$$\operatorname{vol}_o^F(-D) = \limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{l_R(\mathcal{O}_X/\mathfrak{a}_k)}{k^n/n!},$$

where k is sufficiently divisible and $\mathfrak{a}_k = \mu_*(\mathcal{O}_Y(-kD))$.

Proof. This follows from [Ful13, Remark 1.1(ii)] (see also [Ful13, Remark 1.31 and 1.32]). □

The right hand side of the above display is also the volume $\operatorname{vol}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet)$ defined in [ELS03, Definition 3.1, Proposition 3.11]. In particular, given a prime divisor D over o with log discrepancy a, then we see that

$$\operatorname{vol}_o^F(-aD) = \widehat{\operatorname{vol}}_{X,o}(\operatorname{ord}_D).$$

Definition 5.3. *Let $o \in (X, D)$ be a klt singularity. Let $\mu\colon Y \to (X, o)$ be a birational morphism, such that μ is an isomorphism over $X \setminus \{o\}$. Let $E = \sum_i G_i$ be the divisorial part of $\mu^{-1}(o)$. Then we define the volume $\mathrm{vol}_{(X,D),o}(Y)$ (abbreviated as $\mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(Y)$ or $\mathrm{vol}(Y)$ if $(X, D; o)$ is clear) of Y to be*

$$\mathrm{vol}_{(X,D),o}(Y) := \mathrm{vol}_o^F(-K_Y - E - \mu_*^{-1}(D)) = \mathrm{vol}_o^F(\sum_i -a_i G_i),$$

where $a_i = A_{X,D}(G_i)$ is the log discrepancy.

We mainly combine the above definition with the following construction.

Definition 5.4. *For a klt pair (X, D) with an idea $\mathfrak{a}$, we denote by c its log canonical threshold $\mathrm{lct}(X, D; \mathfrak{a})$. We say $\mu\colon Y \to X$ is a dlt modification of $(X, D + c \cdot \mathfrak{a})$, if*

1. *denote the divisorial part of $\mu^*(\mathfrak{a})$ by $\mathcal{O}(-\sum m_i G_i)$ and denote by $\mu^*(K_X + D) = K_Y + D_Y$, then*

$$D_Y + c \cdot \sum m_i G_i = \mu_*^{-1}(D) + E$$

 where E is the reduced divisor on $\mathrm{Ex}(\mu)$;
2. *$(Y, D_Y + c \cdot \sum m_i G_i)$ is dlt; and*
3. *for any divisor F,*

$$a(F; Y, D_Y + c \cdot \sum m_i G_i) = -1 \text{ if and only if } a(F; X, D + c \cdot \mathfrak{a}) = -1.$$

By the argument in [OX12], we know that it follows the MMP result in [BCHM10] that the dlt modification of $(X, D + c \cdot \mathfrak{a})$ always exists. More precisely, we can choose general elements $f_j \in \mathfrak{a}$ $(1 \le j \le l)$ which generate $\mathfrak{a}$ such that $l > \frac{1}{c}$. Let $D_j = (f_j)$, then Y is the dlt modification of $(X, D + c \cdot \frac{1}{l} \sum_{j=1}^{l} D_j)$.

We do not need property 3 in our argument, but it seems to us it is natural to require this by comparing with [Kol13, Theorem 1.34].

Lemma 5.5. *We can indeed assume that $-K_Y - \mu_*^{-1} D - E$ is nef over X.*

Proof. Since (X, D) is klt, we know that

$$K_Y + \mu_*^{-1} D + E \sim_{\mathbb{Q},X} \sum a_i G_i$$

with $a_i = A_{X,D}(G_i) > 0$. Running an MMP with scaling by an ample divisor, we obtain a relative minimal model $Y \dashrightarrow Y'$ of

$$\big(Y, \mu_*^{-1}(D + c \cdot \frac{1}{l} \sum_{j=1}^{l} D_j) + E - \epsilon \sum a_i G_i\big)$$

for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, whose existence follows from [BCHM10]. Let E be the reduced exceptional divisor of $\mu'\colon Y' \to X$. Notice that by the definition of dlt modification above, we have:

$$K_Y + \mu_*^{-1}(D + c \cdot \frac{1}{l} \sum_{j=1}^{l} D_j) + E \sim_{\mathbb{Q},X} -c \cdot \sum m_i G_i + \sum_i a_i G_i = 0.$$

So we have

$$K_Y + \mu_*^{-1}(D + c \cdot \frac{1}{l}\sum_{j=1}^{l} D_j) + E - \epsilon \sum a_i G_i = -\epsilon(K_Y + \mu_*^{-1} D + E),$$

and hence $-K_{Y'} - \mu'^{-1}_* D - E'$ is nef over X. Furthermore, since

$$K_Y + \mu_*^{-1} D + E \sim_{\mathbb{Q},X} -c \cdot \frac{1}{l}\mu_*^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{l} D_j,$$

Y' also gives a minimal model of the dlt pair

$$\big(Y, \mu_*^{-1}(D + c(1+\epsilon) \cdot \frac{1}{l}\sum_{j=1}^{l} D_j) + E\big),$$

which implies $(Y', \mu'^{-1}_* D + E')$ is a dlt modification of $(X, D + c \cdot \frac{1}{l}\sum_{j=1}^{l} D_j)$. Therefore, we can replace Y by Y'. □

When E is irreducible, then $\mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(Y) = \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(\mathrm{ord}_E)$. We can also generalize Lemma 2.9 to the dlt case.

Lemma 5.6. *In the setting of Definition 5.3, if we assume that $-K_Y - \mu_*^{-1} D - E$ is nef over X. Then*

$$\mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(Y) = \sum_i a_i \big((-K_Y - \mu_*^{-1} D - E)|_{E_i}\big)^{n-1}.$$

Proof. Let m be sufficiently divisible such that $L := m(K_Y + \mu_*^{-1} D + E)$ is Cartier. Denote by F the effective Cartier divisor $F := \sum_i m a_i G_i$. Then

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_Y(L^{\otimes -(k+1)}) \to \mathcal{O}_Y(L^{\otimes -k}) \to \mathcal{O}_F(L^{\otimes -k}) \to 0.$$

Since L^{-1} is nef, we know that $R^1\mu_*(L^{\otimes -(k+1)}) = 0$. Thus

$$\mathrm{vol}_o^F(L) = \mathrm{vol}(L|_F),$$

then we conclude by dividing m^n in both sides. □

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal, we define $c = \mathrm{lct}(X, D; \mathfrak{a})$ and $(Y, E) \to X$ be the dlt modification of $(X, D + c \cdot \mathfrak{a})$. Then*

$$\mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(Y) \leq \mathrm{lct}^n(\mathfrak{a}) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}).$$

Proof. Write $K_Y + \mu_*^{-1} D + E = \mu^*(K_X + D) + \sum_i a_i G_i$, where E is the reduced divisor on $\mathrm{Ex}(\mu)$. If we denote the vanishing order of $\mu^*\mathfrak{a}$ along G_i by m_i, then since c is the log canonical threshold and for every i, G_i computes the log canonical threshold, we know that $c \cdot m_i = a_i$. Thus

$$\mathfrak{a}^k \subset \mu_* \mathcal{O}_Y(-\sum_i k m_i G_i) =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathfrak{b}_k.$$

It suffices to show that

$$\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet) = \mathrm{vol}_o^F(-\sum m_i G_i),$$

but this follows Lemma 5.2. □

Lemma 5.8. *Notations as above. Then there exists a Kollár component S, such that*

$$\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_S) \leq \mathrm{vol}(Y).$$

Proof. It follows from Proposition 2.8 that we can choose a model $W \to Y$ and run MMP to obtain $W \dashrightarrow Y'$, such that $Y' \to X$ gives a Kollár component S with $a(Y, E; S) = -1$. If we fix a common resolution $p\colon W' \to Y$ and $q\colon W' \to Y'$, then since $-(K_Y + E)$ is nef and $A_{Y,E}(S) = 0$, we know $-p^*(K_Y + E) + q^*(K_{Y'} + S)$ is q-nef and q-exceptional. By the negativity lemma, we get

$$p^*(K_Y + E) \geq q^*(K_{Y'} + S).$$

Thus

$$\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_S) = \mathrm{vol}(-K_{Y'} - S) \leq \mathrm{vol}(-K_Y - E) = \mathrm{vol}(Y).$$

□

5.2 Proof of Theorem 1.6 and 1.5

With the above discussions, we can start to prove our theorems.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. By Proposition 2.6, we know

$$\inf_v \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(v) = \inf_{\mathfrak{a}} \mathrm{lct}^n(\mathfrak{a}) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}).$$

By the above construction in Lemma 5.7 and 5.8, for any $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal $\mathfrak{a}$, we know that there exists a Kollár component S, such that

$$\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_S) \leq \mathrm{lct}^n(\mathfrak{a}) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}).$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.6. □

As Example 6.2 shows that for a general klt singularity (X, o), the minimum is not always achieved by a Kollár component. Thus we have to take a limit process. However, if the minimizer v has rational rank 1, then it should always yield a Kollár component. First we have the following result which is inspired by the work in [Blu16a]. We note that it is also independently proved in [Blu16b].

Lemma 5.9. *If $E \in \mathrm{Val}_{X,o}$ such that ord_E minimizes $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(X, D)$. Then the Rees algebra associated to ord_E is finitely generated.*

Proof. If we let $\{\mathfrak{a}_\bullet\}$ be the graded valuative ideas associated to ord_E, then we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_E) &= \lim_{k\to\infty} A_{X,D}(\mathrm{ord}_E)^n \cdot \frac{\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_k)}{k^n} \\ &\geq \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathrm{lct}(X, D; \mathfrak{a}_k)^n \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_k) \\ &\geq \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_E) \end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 2.6 and our assumption that ord_E is a minimizer of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(X, D)$. So we conclude that (see [Mus02])

$$\mathrm{lct}(X, D; \mathfrak{a}_\bullet) := \lim_{k\to\infty} k \cdot \mathrm{lct}(X, D; \mathfrak{a}_k) = A_{X,D}(\mathrm{ord}_E),$$

which we denote by c. Therefore, we can choose ϵ sufficiently small, such that the discrepancy $a(E; X, D + (1-\epsilon)c \cdot \mathfrak{a}_\bullet) \in (-1, 0)$,

On the other hand, we know

$$\mathrm{lct}(X, D; \mathfrak{a}_\bullet) = \lim_{m\to\infty} m \cdot \mathrm{lct}(X, D; \mathfrak{a}_m).$$

So for sufficiently large m, we know that for all G, the discrepancy

$$a(G; X, D + \frac{1}{m}(1-\epsilon)c \cdot \mathfrak{a}_m) > -1.$$

We also have $a(E; X, D + \frac{1}{m}(1-\epsilon)c \cdot \mathfrak{a}_m) < 0$. Then similar to the discussion in 5.4, we can find general $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor Δ, such that $(X, D + \frac{1}{m}(1-\epsilon)c \cdot \Delta)$ is klt and $a(E; X, D + \frac{1}{m}(1-\epsilon)c \cdot \Delta) < 0$. In particular, we can apply [BCHM10] to obtain a model $\mu\colon Y \to X$ such that $\mathrm{Ex}(\mu) = E$ and $-E$ is μ-ample, which implies the finite generation. □

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Applying Lemma 5.9, the assumption in Case 1 which says v is a divisorial valuation implies the assumption in Case 2, thus we only need to treat the Case 2.

By the proof of Proposition 2.6, we know that if we let $\mathfrak{a}_k$ be the ideal of elements with values at least k, then

$$A_{X,D}(v)^n \cdot \frac{\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_k)}{k^n} \quad \geq \quad \left(\frac{A_{X,D}(v)}{v(\mathfrak{a}_k)}\right)^n \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_k) \geq \mathrm{lct}^n(X, D; \mathfrak{a}_k) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_k).$$

By the finite generation assumption, we know that $\mathfrak{a}_{kl} = \mathfrak{a}_k^l$ for sufficiently divisible k and any l. So replace k by kl in the above display and let $l \to +\infty$, we know that

$$\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(v) \geq \mathrm{lct}^n(X, D; \mathfrak{a}_k) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_k) \geq \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(v).$$

Take $\mu\colon Y \to X$ to be the dlt modification of $(X, D + \mathrm{lct}(X, D, \mathfrak{a}_k) \cdot \mathfrak{a}_k)$ as given in Lemma 5.5. The above discussion then implies that

$$\mathrm{lct}^n(X, D; \mathfrak{a}_k) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}_k) \geq \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}(v) = \mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(Y).$$

It follows from Proposition 2.8, that we can choose a model $W \to Y$ and running MMP to obtain $W \dashrightarrow Y'$, such that $\mu'\colon Y' \to X$ gives a Kollár component S with $a(S; Y, \mu^{-1}D_* + E) = -1$. We only need to show that if Y' and Y are not isomorphic in codimension 1, then

$$\mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(Y') < \mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(Y).$$

This is the the local analog of the argument in [LX14, Proposition 5]. We give the details for the reader's convenience.

Let $\pi\colon Y \to Y^{\mathrm{c}}$ be the canonical model of $-K_Y - \mu_*^{-1}D - E$ over X, which exists because

$$-\epsilon(K_Y + \mu_*^{-1}D + E) \sim_{\mathbb{Q},X} K_Y + \mu_*^{-1}(D + c \cdot \frac{1}{l}\sum D_j) + E - \epsilon\sum_i A_{X,D}(G_i)G_i$$

is a klt pair for ϵ sufficiently small. The assumption that Y' and Y are not isomorphic in codimension 1 implies $Y^{\mathrm{c}} \neq Y$.

Take $p\colon \hat{Y} \to Y$ and $q\colon \hat{Y} \to Y'$ a common log resolution, and write

$$p^*(K_Y + \mu_*^{-1}D + E) = q^*(K_{Y'} + \mu'^{-1}_* D + S) + G.$$

By negativity lemma (cf. [KM98, 3.39]), we conclude that $G \geq 0$. Since

$$K_Y + \mu_*^{-1}D + E \sim_{\mathbb{Q},X} \sum_i A_{X,D}(G_i)G_i$$

and

$$K_{Y'} + \mu'^{-1}_* D + S \sim_{\mathbb{Q},X} A_{X,D}(S),$$

we know that

$$p^*(\sum_i A_{X,D}(G_i)G_i) = q^*(A_{X,D}(S)) + G.$$

For $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, let

$$L_\lambda = q^*(A_{X,D}(S)) + \lambda G = \sum_i b_i(\lambda)F_i,$$

where F_i runs over all divisor supports on $\hat{Y}_o := \hat{Y} \times_X \{o\}$, and $-L_\lambda|_{\hat{Y}_o}$ is nef. Define

$$f(\lambda) = \sum_i b_i(\lambda)(-L_\lambda|_{F_i})^{n-1},$$

thus $f(\lambda)$ is non-decreasing as $G \geq 0$. By Lemma 2.9 and 5.6, we know that

$$f(1) = \mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(Y) \qquad \text{and} \qquad f(0) = \mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(Y').$$

Since $Y \dashrightarrow Y'$ are not isomorphic incodimension 1, it must contract some component G_1 of E, and the coefficient of G_1 in G is

$$a := A_{Y',\mu'^{-1}_* D+S}(G_1) > 0.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{df(\lambda)}{d\lambda}|_{\lambda=1} &= n \cdot G \cdot \big(-p^*(K_Y + \mu_*^{-1}D + E)\big)^{n-1} \\ &\geq n \cdot aG_1 \cdot \big(-\pi_*(K_Y + \mu_*^{-1}D + E)\big)^{n-1} \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(Y') = f(0) < f(1) = \mathrm{vol}_{X,o}(Y)$. □

With all this discussion, we also obtain the following result, which characterizes the equality condition in Proposition 2.6, which is a corresponding generalization of [dFEM04, Theorem 1.4] (see Remark 5.11). See [Laz04b, 9.6] for more background.

Theorem 5.10. *Let $(X, o) = (\mathrm{Spec}(R), \mathfrak{m})$. Assume (X, D) is a klt singularity for a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $D \geq 0$. If there exists an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal $\mathfrak{b}$, such that $\mathrm{lct}^n(X, D; \mathfrak{b}) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{b})$ is equal to $\inf_{v \in \mathrm{Val}_{X,o}} \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(v)$, then (X, D) is quasi-regular.*

Moreover, for an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$,

$$\mathrm{lct}^n(X, D; \mathfrak{a}) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}) = \inf_{v \in \mathrm{Val}_{X,o}} \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(v),$$

if and only if there exists a Kollár component S and a positive integer k such that ord_S *computes the log canonical threshold of* $\mathfrak{a}$ *on* $o \in (X, D)$ *with*

$$\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_S) = \inf_{v \in \mathrm{Val}_{X,o}} \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(v),$$

and the only associated Rees valuation of $\mathfrak{a}^k$ *is* ord_S.

Proof. By the argument in Theorem 1.5, we see that

$$\mathrm{lct}^n(X, D; \mathfrak{b}) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{b})$$

reaches the minimum of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}$ if and only if the dlt modification of

$$(X, D; c \cdot \mathfrak{b}) \qquad \text{where } c = \mathrm{lct}(X, D; \mathfrak{b})$$

is a model $\mu : Y \to X$ which only extracts a Kollár component S of (X, D) such that ord_S is a minimizer of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}$. In particular, (X, D) is quasi-regular.

Now we fix an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ such that

$$\mathrm{lct}^n(X, D; \mathfrak{a}) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}) = \inf_{v \in \mathrm{Val}_{X,o}} \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(v),$$

and S is the Kollár component we obtain as above. Let $\mu^*\mathfrak{a}$ have the vanishing order m along S. Since S is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, then let k be a positive integer such that mkS is Cartier. We claim that

$$\mu^*(\mathfrak{a}^k) = \mathcal{O}_Y(-mkS).$$

Granted this for now, then we know that Y coincides with the normalized blow up $X^+ \to X$ of $\mathfrak{a}^k$, i.e., S is the only associated Rees valuation for $\mathfrak{a}^k$.

To see the claim, since $-mkS$ is Cartier, we know that

$$\mu^*(\mathfrak{a}^k) = \mathfrak{c} \cdot \mathcal{O}_Y(-mkS) \qquad \text{for some ideal } \mathfrak{c} \subset \mathcal{O}_Y,$$

and we aim to show that $\mathfrak{c}$ is indeed trivial. If not, we take a normalized blow up $\phi\colon Y^+ \to Y$ of $\mathfrak{c}$, so $\phi^*\mathfrak{c} = \mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(-E)$ for some effective Cartier divisor E. Since $-S$ is ample over X, we can choose l sufficiently big, such that

$$-D := -\phi^*(mklS) - E$$

on Y^+ is ample over X.

Since

$$(\mu \circ \phi)^*\mathfrak{a}^{kl} = \mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(-\phi^*(mklS) - lE) \subset \mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(-\phi^*(mklS) - E),$$

we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}^{kl}) &\geq \mathrm{vol}_o^F(-\phi^*(mklS) - E) \\
&= \mathrm{vol}_o^F(-D) \\
&= mkl(-D|_{\phi^*S})^{n-1} + (-D|_E)^{n-1} \\
&> mkl(mkl(-S)|_S)^{n-1} \\
&= (mkl)^n \mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{ord}_S).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathrm{lct}^n(X, D; \mathfrak{a}) = \frac{1}{l} \cdot A_{X,D}(\mathrm{ord}_S)$, we can easily see the above inequality is contradictory to the assumption that

$$\mathrm{lct}^n(X, D; \mathfrak{a}) \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}) = \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_S).$$

Here the inequality in the fourth row comes from a similar but easier calculation as in the proof of of Theorem 1.5.

For the converse direction, since $\mathfrak{a}$ reaches the minimum if and only if $\mathfrak{a}^k$ reaches the minimum, then we can replace $\mathfrak{a}$ by $\mathfrak{a}^k$ and assume its only associated Rees valuation is ord_S, i.e., we know that the normalized blow up $\mu\colon X^+ \to X$, has the property that $\mu^*(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-mS)$. Then the valuative ideal

$$\mathfrak{a}_{mk} = \overline{\mathfrak{a}^k},$$

where $\overline{\mathfrak{a}^k}$ means the integral closure of $\mathfrak{a}^k$. And $\mathrm{lct}(X, D; \mathfrak{a}) = \frac{A_{X,D}(S)}{m}$. We claim that

$$\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}) = \lim_{k \to +\infty} \frac{n! \cdot l_R(R/\overline{\mathfrak{a}^k})}{k^n},$$

and this immediately implies that

$$\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_S) = \mathrm{lct}(X, D; \mathfrak{a})^n \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}).$$

To see the claim, if we denote by $\mathcal{J}(\mathfrak{a}^k) = \mathcal{J}(X, D; \mathfrak{a}^k)$ the multiplier ideal, then we know that

$$\mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a}) = \lim_{k \to +\infty} \frac{n! \cdot l_R(R/\mathcal{J}(\mathfrak{a}^k))}{k^n},$$

by the local Skoda Theorem [Laz04b, 9.6.39]. On the other hand, since (X, D) is klt, we have

$$\overline{\mathfrak{a}^k} \subset \mathcal{J}(\mathfrak{a}^k),$$

thus we are done. □

Remark 5.11. *In the proof, we indeed show that for any k such that mkS is Cartier on Y, the integral closure $\overline{\mathfrak{a}^k}$ coincides with the valuative ideal $\mathfrak{a}_{mk}$ of* ord_S.

6 Examples and questions

6.1 Examples

In this section, we find out the minimizer for some examples of klt singularities $(X, o) = (\mathrm{Spec}R, \mathfrak{m})$. We note that by Proposition 2.6 and 5.10, this also explicit calculates

$$\inf_{\mathfrak{a}} \mathrm{lct}(X, \mathfrak{a})^n \cdot \mathrm{mult}(\mathfrak{a})$$

for all $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideals $\mathfrak{a}$ and gives the equality condition, which generalizes the results in [dFEM04] on a smooth point.

Example 6.1. *1. (cf. [LL16, Example 4.9]) Let $(X,o)=(\mathbb{C}^n,0)/G$ be an n-dimensional quotient singularity. Let $E\cong\mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ be the exceptional divisor over $\mathbb{C}^n$ obtained by blowing up 0. Then denote by S the valuation over (X,o) which is the quotient of E by G. Then we know that (S,Δ_S) is log-K-polystable, where Δ_S encodes the branched divisor. So $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}$ minimizes at ord_S with $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(\mathrm{ord}_S)=\frac{n^n}{|G|}$ by Lemma 2.7.*

2. Consider the n-dimensional A_{k-1} singularity:

$$X=A^n_{k-1}:=\{z_1^2+\cdots+z_n^2+z_{n+1}^k=0\}.$$

We consider cases when $k>\frac{2(n-1)}{n-2}$ (for other cases, see [LL16, Example 4.7]). We want to show that the valuation corresponding to the weight $w_*=(n-1,\cdots,n-1,n-2)$ is a minimizer among all valuations in $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}$. In [Li15a, Example 2.8], these are computed out as the minimizer among all valuations obtained by weighted blow ups on the ambient space $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$.

We notice that under the weighted blow up corresponding to w_*, we have a birational morphism $Y\to X$ with exceptional divisor S isomorphic to the weighted hypersurface

$$S:=\{Z_1^2+\cdots+Z_n^2=0\}\subset\mathbb{P}(n-1,\cdots,n-1,n-2)=:\mathbb{P}_{w_*}.$$

Because $\mathbb{P}_{w_*}\cong\mathbb{P}(1,\cdots,1,n-2)$, it is easy to see that S is isomorphic to $\bar{C}(Q,-K_Q)$ where $Q=Q^{n-2}=\{Z_1^2+\cdots+Z_n^2=0\}\subset\mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ (notice that $K_Q^{-1}=(n-2)H$). On the other hand, because $\mathbb{P}_{w_*}$ is not well-formed, we have codimensional 1 orbifold locus along the infinity divisor $Q_\infty\subset S$ with the isotropy group $\mathbb{Z}/(n-1)\mathbb{Z}$. So the corresponding Kollár component is the log Fano pair $\left(S,(1-\frac{1}{n-1})Q_\infty\right)$. Because Q_∞ has KE, by [LL16] there is a conical KE on the pair $\left(S,(1-\frac{1}{n-1})Q_\infty\right)$. So by Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3, ord_S is indeed a global minimizer of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}$ that is the unique minimizer among all Kollár components. Notice that for any higher order klt perturbation of these singularities, w_* is also a minimizer.

3. We can also use Theorem 1.2 to verify that the valuations in [Li15a, Example 2.8] for E_k (k=6,7,8) are indeed minimizers in $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}$, which are unique among Kollár components. To avoid repetition, we will only do this for E_7 singularities. The argument for other two cases are similar. So consider the $(n+1)$-dimensional E_7 singularity:

$$X^{n+1}=\{z_1^2+z_2^2+\cdots+z_n^2+z_{n+1}^3z_{n+2}+z_{n+2}^3=0\}\subset\mathbb{C}^{n+2}.$$

(a) If $n+1=2$, then X^2 is a quotient singularity $\mathbb{C}^2/E_7$ and so we get the unique polystable component by [LL16, Example 4.9] and example 1 above.

(b) If $n+1=3$, then $X^3=\{z_1^2+z_2^2+z_3^3z_4+z_4^3=0\}\subset\mathbb{C}^4\cong\{w_1w_2+w_3^3w_4+w_4^3=0\}\subset\mathbb{C}^4$ by the change of variables. This singularity has a $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$-action and is an example of T-variety of complexity one. By the recent work in [CS15, Theorem 7.1 (II)], X^3 indeed has a Ricci flat cone Kähler metric associated to the canonical $\mathbb{C}^*$-action associated to w_*. So by [LL16, Theorem 1.7], the unique K-polystable Kollár component is given by the orbifold $X^3/\langle w_*\rangle$.

(c) *$n+1=4$, then under the weighted blow up corresponding to $w_*=(9,9,9,5,6)$, we have a birational morphism $\hat{X}\to X$ with exceptional divisor E isomorphic to the weighted hypersurface*

$$E=\{z_1^2+z_2^2+z_3^2+z_5^3=0\}\subset\mathbb{P}(9,9,9,5,6)=\mathbb{P}(w_*).$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(w_*)$ is not well-formed, we have:

$$E\cong\{z_1^2+z_2^2+z_3^2+z_5^3=0\}\subset\mathbb{P}(3,3,3,5,2)=\mathbb{P}'.$$

with orbifold locus of isotropy group $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ along

$$V=\{z_1^2+z_2^2+z_3^2+z_5^3=0\}\subset\mathbb{P}(3,3,3,2).$$

Alternatively, E is a weighted projective cone over the weighted hypersurface. It is easy to see that as an orbifold $(V,\Delta)\cong\big(\mathbb{P}^2,(1-\frac{1}{3})Q\big)$ where $Q=\{z_1^2+z_2^2+z_3^2=0\}\subset\mathbb{P}^2$. By [LS14], there exists an orbifold Kähler-Einstein metric on (V,Δ). Notice that $-(K_V+\Delta)=3L-\frac{4}{3}L=\frac{5}{3}L$ where L is the hyperplane bundle of $\mathbb{P}^2$. Denoting by H the hyperplane bundle of $\mathbb{P}'$, then $H|_V=L/3$. If V is considered as a divisor of E, then

$$V|_V=\big(\{z_4=0\}\cap E\big)=5H|_V=\frac{5}{3}L.$$

So $-(K_V+\Delta)=V|_V$.
Then by [LL16, Theorem 1.7], there exists an orbifold Kähler-Einstein metric on E because the cone angle at infinity is $\beta=1/3$. Thus the unique log-K-semistable (actually log-K-polystable) Kollár component is given by the pair $\big(E,\big(1-\frac{1}{3}\big)V\big)$.

(d) *$n+1=5$, under the weighted blow up corresponding to $w_*=(3,3,3,3,2,2)$, we have a birational morphism $\hat{X}\to X$ with exceptional divisor E isomorphic to the weighted hypersurface:*

$$E=\{z_1^2+z_2^2+z_3^2+z_4^2+z_6^3=0\}\subset\mathbb{P}(3,3,3,3,2,2)=:\mathbb{P}(w_*).$$

This is a weighted projective cone over the weighted hypersurface:

$$V=\{z_1^2+z_2^2+z_3^2+z_4^2+z_6^3=0\}\subset\mathbb{P}(3,3,3,3,2).$$

As orbifold, we have $(V,\Delta)=\big(\mathbb{P}^3,(1-\frac{1}{3})Q\big)$. By [LS14, Li13], (V,Δ) is log-K-semistable and degenerates to a conical Kähler-Einstein pair. So by [LL16], we know that $(E,(1-\beta)V_\infty)$ is log-K-semistable. To determine β, we notice that

$$-(K_V+\Delta)=4L-\frac{4}{3}L=\frac{8}{3}L=4\cdot\frac{2}{3}L=4\cdot V_\infty|_V.$$

So $\beta=1$ and we conclude that the unique (strictly) K-semistable Kollár component is indeed the $\mathbb{Q}$-Fano variety E.

(e) *$n+1\geq 6$. Under the weighted blow up corresponding to $w_*=(n-1,\dots,n-1,n-2,n-2)$, we have a birational morphism $\hat{X}\to X$ with exceptional divisor E isomorphic to the weighted hypersurface:*

$$E=\{z_1^2+\cdots+z_n^2=0\}\subset\mathbb{P}(n-1,\cdots,n-1,n-2,n-2)=:\mathbb{P}(w_*).$$

This is the weighted projective cone over

$$V = \{z_1^2 + \cdots + z_n^2 = 0\} \subset \mathbb{P}(n-1, \cdots, n-1, n-2).$$

By the discussion in the above A_{k-1}^n singularity case, we know that as an orbifold, $(V, \Delta) = \left(\bar{C}(Q, -K_Q), (1 - \frac{1}{n-1})Q_\infty\right)$, which has an orbifold Kähler-Einstein metric. Notice that

$$-(K_V + \Delta) = (n(n-1) + n - 2)H|_V - 2(n-1)H|_V = n(n-2)H|_V.$$

By [LL16, Theorem 1.7], the $\mathbb{Q}$-Fano variety E indeed has an orbifold Kähler-Einstein metric ($\beta = n/n = 1$ at infinity) and hence by Theorem 1.2 is the unique K-semistable (actually K-polystable) Kollár component.

We remark that, however, in the case of D_{k+1} singularities, since the valuations computed out in [Li15a, Example 2.8] could be irrational, our method can not directly tell whether it is a minimizer in $\mathrm{Val}_{X,o}$.

4. *A notion called weakly-exceptional singularity is introduced in [Pro00]. As the name suggested, this is a weaker notion than the exceptional singularity introduced in [Sho00], which forms a special class of singularities in the theory of local complements. In our language, a singularity (X, o) is weakly-exceptional if and only if it has a unique Kollár component S. We know that if a singularity is weakly-exceptional, then the log α-invariant for the log Fano (S, Δ_S) is at least 1 (see [Pro00, Theorem 4.3] and [CS14]). In particular, we know that (S, Δ_S) has a weak conic Kähler-Einstein metric (see [Ber13, Theorem 3.12]). And by Theorem 1.2 and 1.3, we know ord_S is the unique minimizer of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}(S)$ among all Kollár components. See [CS14] for examples of weakly exceptional singularities.*

The following example is indeed a prototype of our study.

Example 6.2 (Sasakian geometry)**.** *Assume $X = \mathrm{Spec}R$ is an affine variety with effective torus action and $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein klt isolated singularity at $o \in X$. Denote the torus by $\mathbb{T} := (\mathbb{G}_m)^d$. Then we have a weight decomposition:*

$$R = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Gamma} R_\alpha,$$

where

- *For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $R_\alpha = \{f \in R\ ;\ t \cdot f = t^\alpha f$ for any $t \in (\mathbb{G}_m)^d\}$.*
- *$\Gamma = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^d; R_\alpha \neq 0\}$.*

The Reeb cone of X is the following conic subset of the Lie algebra of $\mathbb{T} = (\mathbb{G}_m)^d$:

$$\mathcal{RC} := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d; \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle > 0 \text{ for any } \alpha \in \Gamma\}.$$

Notice that the elements in the Reeb cone $\mathcal{RC}$ can be considered as holomorphic vector fields on X via the map $\xi \mapsto \sigma_\xi := \sum_{i=1}^d \xi_i \sigma_i$ where σ_i is the infinitesimal generator of the action of the i-th factor of $(\mathbb{G}_m)^d$. If we denote by $\{e_i\}$ the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$, then

$$\sigma_i(p) = \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} \exp(se_i) \circ p - \sqrt{-1}\, \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} \exp(\sqrt{-1}se_i) \circ p.$$

Suppose that there is a Kähler cone metric $g_\xi = dr^2 + r^2 g_L$ on X where

1. *$r : X - \{o\} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is a smooth radius function, $L = \{r = 1\} \subset X$ is the link of the isolated singularity (X, o).*
2. *$r\frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \sqrt{-1}J(r\frac{\partial}{\partial r}) = \sigma_\xi$.*

Now assume that g_ξ is a Ricci-flat Kähler metric, equivalently the link L has a Sasaki-Einstein metric (see [BG08]). There are two different cases:

1. *(quasi-regular case) If the generic orbit of $\partial_\theta := J(r\frac{\partial}{\partial r})$ is closed, g_L is called a quasi-regular Sasaki-Einstein metric. σ_ξ generates a $\mathbb{G}_m$-subgroup of $\mathbb{T}$. the quotient $X/\mathbb{G}_m$ is an Fano orbifold (V, Δ) with orbifold Kähler-Einstein metric. By [LL16] ord_V is a minimizer of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}$. By Theorem 1.3, this is the unique minimizer among all Kollár components.*
2. *(irregular case) If the generic orbit of ∂_θ is not closed, g_L is called an irregular Sasaki-Einstein metric. Explicit examples can be found in [GMSW04a, GMSW04b, FOW09]. Since $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an irrational vector, we can approximate it by a sequence of rational vectors $\{\xi_k\} \subset \mathcal{RC} \cap \mathbb{Q}^d$. Each ξ_k generates a $\mathbb{G}_m$-subgroup G_k of $\mathbb{T}$, and we get a sequence of quotients $X/G_k = (V_k, \Delta_k)$. It is easy to see that V_k are all Kollár components. It is possible to show that a suitable rescaling $c_k \cdot \mathrm{ord}_{V_k}$ converges to a minimizer of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{(X,o)}$, which corresponds to the vector field σ_ξ. The details will be discussed in [LX16].*

Example 6.3 (Quasi-regular metric tangent cones [DS15])**.** *Assume (X, o) is an algebraic germ on a normal affine variety that is embedded into $\mathbb{C}^N$. Assume that we have a weight vector $w = (a_1, \ldots, a_N) \in \mathbb{Z}^N_{>0}$ satisfying that there is no common factor of a_i. Then it defines a filtration on $R = \mathcal{O}_{X,o}$:*

$$\mathcal{F}^k = \{f \in R;\ \text{there exists } g \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}^N,o} \text{ with } g|_X = f \text{ and } w(g) \geq k\}. \tag{10}$$

From this we can form the Rees algebra and extended Rees algebra:

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{+\infty} \mathcal{F}^k t^{-k}, \quad \mathcal{R}' = \bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^k t^{-k},$$

where $\mathcal{F}^k = R$ if $k \leq 0$. We also have the associated graded ring of $(R, \mathcal{F})$:

$$G = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{+\infty} \left(\mathcal{F}^k/\mathcal{F}^{k+1}\right) \cdot t^{-k} \cong \mathcal{R}'/t\mathcal{R}'.$$

In our discussion, we always assume that G is a finitely generated $\mathbb{C}$-algebra that is also a normal domain. Then we can get a normal affine variety $W = \mathrm{Spec}(G)$. As in [DS15], we call W to be a weighted tangent cone of (X, o). Notice that there is a natural $\mathbb{C}^*$-action on G and hence it is an orbifold cone over the base $E = \mathrm{Proj}(G)$ (by Pinkham-Demazure's construction).

On the other hand, the weight w defines a weighted blow up $\pi_w : \widehat{\mathbb{C}^N} \to \mathbb{C}^N$ given by:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{C}^N} = \mathrm{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{k=0}^{+\infty} \mathfrak{A}_k \cdot t^{-k}\right),$$

where

$$\mathfrak{A}_k = \{g \in \mathbb{C}[z_1, \cdots, z_n]; w(g) \geq k\}.$$

Notice that the exceptional divisor of π_w is the weighted projective space with weight w. We have the following observation, which implies that the discussion can be put in the setting of filtered blowing-ups as studied in [TW89].

Lemma 6.4. *1. If Y denotes the strict transform of X under π_w, then $Y = \mathrm{Proj}(\mathcal{R})$. In particular the Rees algebra $\mathcal{R}$ is finitely generated. Moreover, the exceptional divisor of the natural birational morphism $Y \xrightarrow{\psi} X$ is isomorphic to E.*

2. The filtration $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}^k\}_{k\geq 0}$ is the same as the filtration induced by the divisorial valuation ord_E.

Proof. Denoting by $\iota_X : X \to \mathbb{C}^N$ the embedding morphism, then $\mathcal{F}^k$ in (10) coincides with the inverse image ideal $\iota_X^{-1}\mathfrak{A}_k \cdot \mathcal{O}_{X,o}$ (cf. [Har77, 7.15]). So Y is indeed the strict transform of X under the weighted blow up π_w. The second statement is standard (see [TW89, 1.2.1]). Item 2 follows from [TW89, (2.2)]. □

If (X, o) is a klt singularity appearing in a Gromov-Hausdorff limit of a sequence of Kähler-Einstein Fano manifolds, Donaldson-Sun ([DS15]) constructed an affine variety W using the metric structure on the Gromov-Hausdorff limit and showed that it specially degenerates to the metric tangent cone $C(Y)$. The degeneration can be realized under a common embedding of W and $C(Y)$ into some ambient $\mathbb{C}^N$. More precisely W is a weighted tangent cone associated to some weight under the common embedding. The weight is determined by the Reeb vector field of the singular Ricci flat metric on $C(Y)$. If the Reeb vector field is quasi-regular, that is, if it generates a $\mathbb{C}^*$-action, then the weight can be normalized to have integer components so that we are in the situation discussed above. Moreover in this case $E = W \setminus \{0\}/\mathbb{C}^*$ specially degenerates to $C(Y) \setminus \{0\}/\mathbb{C}^*$ and $C(Y) \setminus \{0\}/\mathbb{C}^*$ admits a weak Kähler-Einstein metric (see [DS15]). So we can apply our result Theorem 1.2 to see that ord_E is indeed a global minimizer of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}$ over (X, o), which is the unique minimizer among all Kollár components.

6.2 Further questions

Inspired by the picture of Sasakian geometry (see Example 6.2) and the results we have obtained, we make the following conjecture, which refines [Li15a, Conjecture 6.1.1-3].

Conjecture 6.5. *Let (X, o) be a klt singularity. Then there is a unique minimizer v of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}$. Moreover there are only the following two kinds of possible geometry depending on the rational rank of v:*

1. *(Quasi-regular case) v is a multiple of ord_S for a Kollár component S, and (S, Δ_S) is a K-semistable log Fano pair; or*
2. *(Irregular case) v is quasi-monomial of rational rank $p > 1$. Furthermore, there is a model $\mu\colon Y \to X$, such that if we denote by D the reduced exceptional divisor, then D has precisely p components, (Y, D) is dlt with $-K_Y - D$ nef over X, and v is computed on a minimal lc center of (Y, D).*

In the second conjectural case, the sequence of Kollár components in Theorem 1.6 can be chosen to be toroidal divisors whose coordinates are induced by rational numbers approximating the coefficients of the quasi-monomial valuation v.

What kind of geometric property that this dichotomy picture has is not completely clear to us. For instance, we ask the following question:

Question 6.6. *Assume Conjecture 6.5 holds. Let $(X, D) \to B$ be a family of klt singularities. Does the locus parametrizing the fibers with a quasi-regular minimizer form a (Zariski) open set?*

By the argument in Section 3, we know that for a quasi-regular klt singularity (X_0, D_0) in a family (X_b, D_b), there is a Kollár component S_0 whose corresponding valuation ord_{S_0} computes the minimum of the normalized volume $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X_0,D_0}$. Assume we can deform S_0 to obtain a family of Kollár components S_b over (X_b, D_b), then ord_{S_b} computes the minimum of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X_b,D_b}$. In particular, the nearby klt singularities (X_b, D_b) are all quasi-regular.

Conjecture 6.5 is directly related to the conjecture in [Li15a, Conjecture 6.1.5] that is in turn motivated by the study of metric tangent cones in [DS15]. We end this paper by a brief discussion of a corresponding conjecture (see [Li15a, Section 6.2]). If v_* is the minimizer of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{X,o}$, denote by

$$gr_{v_*}(R) = \bigoplus_{k\in\Phi} \mathfrak{a}_k(v_*)/\mathfrak{a}_{>k}(v_*),$$

the associated graded algebra, where Φ is the valuation semigroup of v_*. Then conjecturally $gr_{v_*}(R)$ is always finitely generated and normal, and

$$W' = \mathrm{Spec}\big(gr_{v_*}(R)\big)$$

specially degenerates to an affine variety that has a singular Ricci-flat metric cone structure (see [Li15a, Conjecture 6.1.5]). In the setting of metric tangent cones in [DS15], we expect that W' always coincides with some weighted tangent cone constructed using metric structure on some Gromov-Hausdorff limit (See [Li15a, Section 6.2]). The quasi-regular case has been explained in Example 6.3. So we are left to verify the irregular case:

Conjecture 6.7. *If the Reeb vector field on the metric tangent cone considered in [DS15] is irregular, then it determines a quasi-monomial valuation v_* over X that is of rational rank bigger than one and is the unique minimizer of $\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_X$.*

References

[BCHM10] C. Birkar, P. Cascini, C. D. Hacon, and J. M$^{\mathrm{c}}$Kernan; Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **23** (2010), 405-468.

[BdFF12] S. Boucksom, T. de Fernex, C. Favre; The volume of an isolated singularity. *Duke Math. J.* **161** (2012), no. 8, 1455-1520.

[Ber13] R. Berman; A thermodynamic formalism for Monge-Ampère equations, Moser-Trudinger inequalities and Kähler-Einstein metrics, *Adv. Math.* **248** (2013), 1254-1297.

[Ber15] R. Berman; K-polystability of $\mathbb{Q}$-Fano varieties admitting Kähler-Einstein metrics, *Invent. Math.* **203** (2015), no. 3, 973-1025.

[BG08] C. Boyer and K. Galicki; Sasakian Geometry, *Oxford Mathematical Monographs*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008.

[BHJ15] S. Boucksom, T. Hisamoto and M. Jonsson. Uniform K-stability, Duistermaat-Heckman measures and singularities of pairs, arXiv:1504.06568.

[Blu16a] H. Blum; On Divisors Computing MLD's and LCT's. arXiv:1605.09662.

[Blu16b] H. Blum; Existence of valuations with smallest normalized volume, to appear.

[CDS15] X. Chen, S. Donaldson and S. Sun; Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifols, I-III, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **28** (2015), 183-197, 199-234, 235-278.

[CS14] I. Chelsov and C. Shramov; Weakly-exceptional singularities in higher dimensions, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **689** (2014), 201-241.

[CS15] T. Collins and G. Székelyhidi; Sasaki-Einstein metrics and K-stability, arXiv:1512.07213

[Cut12] S.D. Cutkosky; Multiplicities associated to graded families of ideals, *Algebra Number Theory* **7** (2013), no. 9, 2059-2083.

[Don02] S. Donaldson; Scalar curvature and stability of toric varieties, *J. Diff. Geom.* 62 (2002), no. 2, 289-349.

[dFEM04] T. de Fernex, L. Ein and M. Mustaţă; multiplicities and log canonical threshold, *J. Alg. Geom.* **13** (2004), 603-615.

[DS15] S. Donaldson and S. Sun; Gromov-Hausdorff limits of Kähler manifolds and algebraic geometry, II, arXiv:1507.05082.

[Eis94] D. Eisenbud; Commutative algebra with a view toward algebraic geometry, Grad. Texts in Math. **150**, Springer-Verlag, 1994.

[ELS03] L. Ein, R. Lazarsfeld and K. E. Smith; Uniform approximation of Abhyankar valuation ideals in smooth function fields, *Amer. J. Math.* **125** (2003), 409-440.

[EP05] A. Engler, A. Prestel, Alexander; Valued fields. *Springer Monographs in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.

[FOW09] A. Futaki, H. Ono and G. Wang; Transverse Kähler geometry of Sasaki manifolds and toric Sasakian-Einstein manifolds, *J. Diff. Geom.*, **83** (2009) 585-635.

[Fuj15] K. Fujita; Optimal bounds for the volumes of Kähler-Einstein Fano manifolds, arXiv:1508.04578.

[Fuj16] K. Fujita; A valuative criterion for uniform K-stability of $\mathbb{Q}$-Fano varieties, arXiv:1602.00901.

[Ful13] M. Fulger; Local volumes of Cartier divisors over normal algebraic varieties, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **63** (2013), no. 5, 1793-1847.

[GMSW04a] J.P. Gauntlett, D. Martelli, J. Sparks and W. Waldram; Sasaki-Einstein metrics on $S_2 \times S_3$, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **8** (2004), 711-734.

[GMSW04b] J.P. Gauntlett, D. Martelli, J. Sparks and W. Waldram; A new infinite class of Sasaki-Einstein manifolds, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **8** (2004), 987-1000.

[Har77] R. Hartshorne; *Algebraic Geometry*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52.

[HX13] C. Hacon and C. Xu; Existence of log canonical closures, *Invent. Math.* **192** (2013), no. 1, 161-195.

[JM12] M. Jonsson and M. Mustaţă; Valuations and asymptotic invariants for sequences of ideals, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **62** (2012), no. 6, 2145-2209.

[KM98] J. Kollár and S. Mori; Birational geometry of algebraic varieties, *Cambridge Tracts in Math.* **134**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998.

[Kol13] J. Kollár; Singularities of the Minimal Model Program, *Cambridge Tracts in Math.*, **200**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2013.

[Laz04a] R. Lazarsfeld; Positivity in algebraic geometry, I: Classical setting: line bundles and linear series, Erger Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. (3) **48**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.

[Laz04b] R. Lazarsfeld; Positivity in algebraic geometry, II. Positivity for vector bundles, and multiplier ideals. Erger Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. (3) **49**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.

[Li11] C. Li; Remarks on logarithmic K-stability, *Commun. Contemp. Math.* **17** (2015), no. 2, 1450020, 17 pp.

[Li13] C. Li; Yau-Tian-Donaldson correspondence for K-semistable Fano manifolds, to appear in *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, arXiv:1302.6681.

[Li15a] C. Li; Minimizing normalized volumes of valuations, arXiv:1511.08164.

[Li15b] C. Li; K-semistability is equivariant volume minimization, arXiv:1512.07205v3.

[Liu16] Y. Liu; The volume of singular Kähler-Einstein Fano varieties, arXiv:1605.01034.

[LL16] C. Li and Y. Liu; Kähler-Einstein metrics and volume minimization, arXiv:1602.05094.

[LM09] R. Lazarsfeld and M. Mustaţă; Convex bodies associated to linear series, *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.* **42** (2009), no. 5, 783-835.

[LS14] C. Li, S. Sun; Conical Kähler-Einstein metrics revisited, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 331 (2014), no. 3, 927-973.

[LWX14] C. Li, X. Wang and C. Xu; Degeneration of Fano Kähler-Einstein manifolds, arXiv:1411.0761.

[LX14] C. Li, and C. Xu; Special test configurations and K-stability of Fano varieties, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **180** (2014), no.1, 197-232.

[LX16] C. Li, and C. Xu; Dlt model of the minimizer of normalized volume function, *in preparation*.

[MSY08] D. Martelli, J. Sparks and S.-T. Yau; Sasaki-Einstein manifolds and volume minimisation, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **280** (2008), 611-673.

[Mus02] M. Mustaţă; On multiplicities of graded sequences of ideals, *Journal of Algebra* **256** (2002), 229-249.

[Oda12] Y. Odaka; The Calabi conjecture and K-stability. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (2012), no. **10**, 2272-2288.

[Oda13] Y. Odaka; The GIT stability of polarized varieties via discrepancy, *Ann. of Math.* (2) **177** (2013), no. 2, 645-661.

[OX12] Y. Odaka and C. Xu; Log-canonical models of singular pairs and its applications, *Math. Res. Lett.* **19** (2012), no.2, 325-334.

[Pro00] Y. Prokhorov; Blow-ups of canonical singularities, Algebra (Moscow, 1998), 301-317, de Gruyter, Berlin, 2000.

[Sho00] V. Shokurov; Complements on surfaces, Algebraic geometry, 10. *J. Math. Sci. (New York)* **102** (2000), no. 2, 3876-3932.

[SSY14] C. Spotti, S. Sun and S. Yao; Existence and deformations of Kähler-Einstein metrics on smoothable $\mathbb{Q}$-Fano varieties, to appear in *Duke Math J.*.

[Tia97] G. Tian; Kähler-Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature, *Invent. Math.* **130** (1997), no. 1, 1-37.

[Tia15] G. Tian; K-stability and Kähler-Einstein metrics, *Comm. Pure and Applied Math.*, **68** (2015), no. 7, 1085-1156.

[TW89] M. Tomari and K. Watanabe; Filtered rings, filtered blowing-ups and normal two-dimensional singularities with "star-shaped" resolution, *Publ. RIMS. Kyoto Univ.* **25** (1989), 681-740.

[TW04] S. Takagi and K. Watanabe; On F-pure thresholds, *J. Algebra* **282** (2004), 278-297.

[WX14] X. Wang and C. Xu; Nonexistence of asymptotic GIT compactification, *Duke Math. J.* **163** (2014), no. 12, 2217-2241.

[Xu14] C. Xu; Finiteness of algebraic fundamental groups, *Compos. Math.* **150** (2014), no. 3, 409-414.

Chi Li
Department of Mathematics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907-2067
li2285@purdue.edu

Chenyang Xu
Beijing International Center for Mathematical Research, Beijing 100871, China
cyxu@math.pku.edu.cn